119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker McPike: "House will come to order. Chaplain for today is

Pastor Jeanette Stephens of Asbury United Methodist Church
in Kankakee. Pastor Stephens is the guest of
Representative Weller. Guests in the balcony may wish to
rise and join us for the morning invocation."

Pastor Stephens: "Shall we pray. Almighty God and Creator, who has declared Thy glory and showed forth Thy handiwork in heavens and the earth, and His glory is shown the throughout the world. We come to Thee as Thy servants. ask you to bless the Honorable George Bush as President this United States, James Thompson as Governor of the great State of Illinois and Lieutenant Governor, George Ryan and all others who rule throughout the world in this straight. Grant that their hearts and minds of our leaders and statesmen as they serve may be filled with love of Thy law and the law of which is life giving may they be stewards and guard these gifts that have been given unto them. they rule and legislate with one mind and establish justice and promote welfare of all peoples. Enable them to rise above self seeking and zeal to nobler concerns of the public good and fill them with Thy love and the love justice and righteousness. Rule their hearts this day and enrich their endeavors that law and order may prevail. pray in a Name that is holy and above every Name, the Creator our God. Yahweh. Christ Jesus. Amen."

Speaker McPike: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."

Ropp - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

aerobic instructors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 became the Bill. We discussed this previously. It's an agreed Bill between...well, myself and the fitness clubs and health centers. They recognize that many of the people that are teaching aerobics classes are not properly trained. And the point of this Bill is to make sure that these instructors are working properly with the men and women that are in these aerobics classes. I ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3836 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 60 'ayes', 48 'nos'. House Bill 3836 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Kubik, we passed your Bill, do you want to call it? Out of the record. Representative Ryder. State Budget, Third Reading. First Bill is House Bill 3001, Representative Leverenz. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3001, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would appropriate the budget of the Illinois State Board of Elections. The total 61...\$6,164,000 move for the passage of House Bill 3001."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3001 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

119th Legislative Day

- Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect the absence of Bruce...Representative Bruce Farley."
- Speaker McPike: "Are there any excused absences on the Republican side? Mr. Black?"
- Black: "I don't believe we have anybody excused today, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Take the record. One hundred and seventeen Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present. Senate Bills First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2171, Van Duyne, a Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. Senate Bill 2231, Granberg, et al, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Senate Bill 2256, Hicks, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to international trade. First Reading of the Bills."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. We're going to start at the...at the back of the printout today, instead of the...instead of starting with Education, as we have all...as we have done all week. And...probably in a half hour we will go to Approp. Bills. All these Bills have been read a Second time, so they can be passed today or tomorrow. Starting with Professional Regulations Second Reading appears House Bill 2074, Representative Kubik. Representative Kubik? House Bill 3386, Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3386, a Bill for an Act to prohibit the solicitation or inducement of sale of real estate.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Assembly, the House Amendment #1, which was placed on the Bill is the Bill, and it deletes all...amends the real estate license

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

act, removes the provision that the Department of Registration Education not exercise its powers except upon report of the real estate appraisal committee. I would ask for...passed out of the Executive Committee 18 to 1. Ask for passage of House Bill 3386."

Speaker McPike: "And on that Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. As I understand it you have made a commitment to the Realtors Association, not to pass the legislation ultimately without an agreement, is that correct?"

McGann: "That is to my knowledge. And I understand it was in agreement."

McCracken: "Yes. Okay. Alright. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion on the question? Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes. This is a shell Bill now?"

McGann: "I believe it is still in the process of a shell Bill, is correct."

Williams: "Do you know what it's ultimate purpose is? Just by any chance...about this time?"

McGann: "My understanding is that it's been working with the community groups and the realtors for a solution to a neighborhood problem. I'd be happy to take it out of the record and talk to you a bit, if you want. It's all been agreed with the realtors to do what we are doing."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 104 'ayes', no 'nays', 9 voting 'present'. House Bill 3386 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3836, Representative Lang. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3836, a Bill for an Act concerning

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- declared passed. House Bill 3143, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3143. a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Supreme Court. Third Reading of the Bill"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 House Bill 3143 is the Bill appropriating monies for the
 court system in Illinois. Out of committee it appropriates
 \$172,386,800 and we made some additions in the floor
 yesterday. I would appreciate your support for House Bill
 3143."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 108 'ayes', 2 'nos' 2, voting 'present'. House Bill 3143 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3168, Representative Leverenz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3168, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the state attorney's appellate prosecutor. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill would appropriate \$5,827,000 for the appellate prosecutor. I move for the passage of House Bill 3168."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 107 'ayes', 1 'no', 1 voting 'present'.

 House Bill 3168 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3171. Read the

119th Legislative Day

- Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3171, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Comptroller. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill would contain \$43,436,600 with the Second Reading changes I move for the passage of House Bill 3171."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3171 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3231. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3231, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Office of the Auditor General.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Auditor General's
 appropriation. I move its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3231 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3264. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3264, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz...Representative Didrickson, for what reason do you rise?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Didrickson: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if it isn't too late to add an Amendment to this Bill. I've been made aware of the fact that it is Representative Ryder's birthday today, and I was wondering, while we don't want to necessarily preserve or pickle him we may want to have a little appropriation here for a birthday cake later on?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

- Ryder: "Being the fiscal conservative that I am, it would be a very small birthday cake. And I think that we ought to proceed with the appropriations. But thank you for the good wishes."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, Happy Birthday on your 50th birthday.

 It's wonderful. Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the passage of
 House Bill 3264. And I'll pay for the cup cake with the
 candle in it myself for Representative Ryder. And ask for
 your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

 On this Bill there are 91 'ayes', 17 'nos', 6 voting 'present'. House Bill 3264 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3271, Mr. Bowman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3271, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a modest sum for a vehicle Bill. I move for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Right. Shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative

119th Legislative Day

- Ryder."
- Ryder: "Just to alert the Republicans this is one of the wheels on a vehicle."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 80 'ayes', 28 'nos', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 3271 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3272. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3272, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the other wheel on the vehicle. I ask for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those
 in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative
 Ryder."
- Ryder: "Just to indicate to Republicans I think we almost have a complete set of tires, but this is a Democratic vehicle."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 65 'ayes', 44 'nos', 5 voting 'present'. House Bill 3272 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3273. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3273, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to various agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Elementary and Secondary Education Budget for a total of \$4.169 billion in GRF and other

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- funds. It is basically at the Governor's level with the exception of a few Amendments, which were adopted yesterday. I move for its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we will see more of this budget later in the year. So, I would...I guess we've got to send this over to the Senate and we'll talk about it later in the year."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', 3 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3273 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

 Representative Williamson."
- Williamson: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote on that last
 Roll Call from 'no' to 'yes'? It seems that somehow or
 other these buttons are not working right this morning.
 And if I could see an electrician it would help get the
 rest of the day fine."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. Let the record indicate that the Lady would have voted 'aye' on House Bill 3273. House Bill 3338. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3338, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the Department of Public Health. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3338 appropriates \$314,862,000 and some dollars for the ordinary/contingent expenses fiscal year '89 for the Department of Public Health and \$814,000 General Revenue Funds for the Governor's Council on Health and Physical Fitness. I move its passage."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3338 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3339. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3339, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Board of Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill appropriates \$19,400,000 for fiscal 91. Premium deficits incurred by the Comprehensive Insurance Health Plan. I move its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 voting 'aye', no 'nays'. House Bill 3339 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3340. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3340, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Health Care Cost Containment Counsel.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3340 appropriates \$2,213,000 for fiscal 91 ordinary and contingent expenses for the Health Care Cost Containment Counsel. I move its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

this Bill there are 105 'ayes', 4 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3340 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3341. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3341, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Department of Public Aid. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Public Aid Bill...Public Aid Budget. This is Bill we're going to have to take a further look at. In its current form having the 50% Democrat Amendment on it is...is not a good idea. But we've got to move this Bill today. As it's before us today it appropriates \$4,094,000,000 (four billion ninety-four million) and some odd dollars for fiscal 91 ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Public Aid. I move its passage."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

Representative Dunn you're voting 'aye'. You want to explain your vote? Go ahead. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it possible I may have a conflict of interest on this legislation to the extent I do, I shall vote my conscience."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you. I'm wondering if the Sponsor would provide just one bit of information. According to the budget as it's constituted now, what is the payment cycle for...for Medicaid providers?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Like I said, this budget is going to have to have some more work. As it is before us, it is fifty-six days. We

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

have to address that, and I'm sure we will."

- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 91 'ayes', 11 'nos', 13 voting 'present'. House Bill 3341 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3342. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3342, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Mental Health Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I do think we need to make the point today that many of these budgets are not in their final form, but because of the deadline we have to move these Bills out. Otherwise we don't have a This Bill, House Bill 3342 appropriates \$932,000,000 some odd dollars for fiscal 91 in contingent expenses for the Department of Mental Health and Disabilities...Developmental Disabilities. I move its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3342 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3343. Representative McGann."
- McGann: "I'm afraid my button didn't...I wanted to vote 'aye' on the last Bill there."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. The record will indicate that Representative McGann would have voted 'aye' on House Bill 3341. House Bill 3342. The record would have indicated that the Gentleman would have voted 'aye' on House Bill 3342. House Bill 3343. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3343, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Medical Center Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

- Stephens: "This Bill appropriate \$971,500 for ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission for fiscal 91. I move its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 96 'ayes', 15 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 3343 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3344. Representative Stephens. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3344, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Department of Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "House Bill 3344 appropriates \$165,249,000 ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging. I move its passage."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3344 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3391. Representative Leverenz. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3391, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- Leverenz: "The Bill be \$26,000 (twenty-six thousand dollars) to the Office of the Treasurer of Transfer. I move for the passage of Bill 3391."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 96 'ayes', 13 'nos', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 3391 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3392. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3392, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Office of State Treasurer. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Treasurer's OCE \$539,787,000 (five hundred thirty-nine million seven eighty-seven). I ask for your 'aye' vote for the passage of 3392."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3392 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3394. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3394, a Bill for an Act appropriating funds in relation to Build Illinois Program. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the third wheel of the train. House Bill 3394 has a hundred dollars in it for a Build Illinois Program. We're sending it to the Senate."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Just to alert the Republicans that this is a Democratic vehicle Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk
will take the record. On this Bill there are 64 'ayes', 44
'nos', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill...Representative
McCracken."

McCracken: "Does it increase the authority, or did it decrease the authority? Does it increase the authority or decrease the authority?"

Leverenz: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "This is not the Bond Bill."

Leverenz: "This is not the regular guy you are looking for."

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker McPike: "On this Bill there are 64 'ayes', 44 'nos', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 3394 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3453, Representative Breslin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3453, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Office of State Appellate Defender.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the appropriation to the Appellate Defender's Office. It's in the amount of \$7,286,223. I ask for passage."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 107 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3453 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3457. Read the Bill, Mr.

119th Legislative Day

- Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3457, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriate \$9,050,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capital Development Board."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 105 'ayes', 2 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 3457 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3458. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3458, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$195,400,000 for new capital projects of the Capital Development Board including those projects that were adopted by Amendment yesterday."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall...Representative Leverenz."

 Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're waiting also for a letter. Tom, you don't know about this, for the director to take care of the new State Police building in Springfield, that would house the...or include the day care center. So, with that we will roll on these Bills."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 93 'ayes', 21 'nos'. House Bill 3458

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 3273 my switch was not working and I'd like to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker McPike: "Let the record indicate that on House Bill 3273 the Lady would have voted 'aye'. House Bill 3459. Representative Ryder Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3459, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations for permanent improvements. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$670,496,000 for reappropriates. for capital projects previously funded by the Capital Development Board."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are lll 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3459 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3460. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3460, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the improvements at community colleges.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is appropriations for \$59,000,000 to the Capital Development Board for permanent improvements on various community colleges."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3460

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3461. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3461, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$20,830,000 of GRF for operation, capital and grant programs as provided."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', 1 'no'. House Bill 3461 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3462. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3462, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "This appropriates \$2,757,071,000 of which \$58 million is GRF for ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Transportation."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, my...I'm going to vote 'no'. Only as a protest. I've been complaining for about five years about the horrendous condition of Route 131 between Route 137 and 120 in North Chicago and Waukegan. It is now scheduled for improvement in 1994. I called the District Engineer a month ago, he said he would get back to me. I tried to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

expedite it...nobody has gotten back to me. I voted for the gas tax increase, and I think, I and the citizens in my district deserve better. I vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', 3 'nos'. House Bill 3462 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3463. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3463, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Historic Preservation Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "This appropriates...is it yours, Ron?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "This appropriates funds for the operation of the Historic Preservation Agency."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3463 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3464. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3464, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Department of Mines and Minerals.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$7,217,000 for the operation of the Department of Mines and Minerals."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110...111 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3464 having received the Constitutional Majority is

- 119th Legislative Day May 17, 1990

 hereby declared passed. House Bill 3465. Read the Bill,

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3465, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Racing Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates in excess of \$13 million for the ordinary and contingent expense of the racing board."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 107 'ayes', 2 'nos'. House Bill 3465 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3466. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3466, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$15,038,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Insurance."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3466 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3467, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3467, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Office of Lieutenant Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "This appropriates \$9,409,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Lieutenant Governor."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3467 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3472. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3472, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Financial Institutions.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "This appropriates to the Department of Financial Institutions for their ordinary and contingent expenses the sum of \$9,636,000 ."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3472 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3473. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3473, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Agriculture. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This makes an appropriation for the operation of the Department of Agriculture."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

119th Legislative Day

May 17. 1990

Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3473 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3474. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3474, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$26,270,000 to the Criminal Justice Information Authority for their ordinary and contingent expenses."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Mulcahey 'aye'. Mulcahey 'aye'. On this Bill there are lll 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3474 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3534. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3534, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$128,050,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Question...have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 3534 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3535. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3535, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the State Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates approximately \$41 million to the Emergency Services and Disaster Agency for their expenses, which is probably going to be a little shy giving the flooding in my district. I move its adoption. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 3535 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3536. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3536, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to Office of Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$9,354,000 for the expenses of the Offices of the Governor."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3536 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3537. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3537, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Property Tax Appeal Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

119th Legislative Day

- Ryder: "Despite the Chairman of this Board, we would move to appropriate \$829,000 (eight hundred twenty-nine thousand) for the Property Tax Appeals Board."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
 Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "And that's the truth."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', and no 'nays'. House Bill 3537 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3538. Representative Ryder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3538, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$1,548,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 114 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 3538 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3539, Representative Churchill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3539, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Sports Facility Authority.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "This Bill appropriates \$18 million from the Illinois

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Sports Facility Fund to the Illinois Sports Facility Authority."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Question of the Sponsor, if I'd have had a chance."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Go ahead."

Dunn: "How much is the appropriation?"

Churchill: "\$18 million."

Dunn: "\$18 million?"

Churchill: "That is correct."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 66 'ayes', 35 'nos', 10 voting 'present'. House Bill 3539 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3540, Representative Ryder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3540, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Professional Regulation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this case because of the Director of the Department of Professional Regulation we appropriate \$21,006,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes' and 1 'no'. House Bill 3540 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3541, Representative Ryder."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3541, a Bill for an Act making

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- appropriation for the Department of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$608 million for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections."
- Speaker: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes', 1 'no'. House Bill 3541 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3543. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3543, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you. In the interests of well trained local government law enforcement officers, we appropriate \$10,094,000 for the ordinary and contingent expenses."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 3543 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3544. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3544, a Bill for an Act to make appropriations for the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$494 million to the operation of the Department of Revenue."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

119th Legislative Day

May 17. 1990

Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there 109 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3544 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3545, Representative Ryder. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3545, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Illinois Arts Council. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Untouched by human hands, the Committee and on the floor. This Bill appropriates \$10,931,000 to the Illinois Arts Council."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 105 'ayes', 5 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 3545 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3546. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3546, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Although we wish this could have been a lot more this does appropriate \$1,300,000 to the Educational Labor Relations Board."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Martinez."

Martinez: "Could you please record me as voting 'aye' on the Arts Bill, please?"

Speaker McPike: "On which Bill, Sir?"

Martinez: "On Illinois Arts Council...3545, I think."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Martinez would like the record to reflect that he would have voted 'aye' on House

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Bill 3545. Question is, 'Shall Bill 3546 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109 'ayes', 4 'nos'. House Bill 3546 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3547. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3547, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the the Judicial Inquiry Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$309,000 to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judicial Inquiry Board."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', 3 'nos'. House Bill 3547 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3548. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3548, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Liquor Control Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. This appropriates from the Dram Shop Fund \$1,667,000 to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Liquor Control Commission."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3548 having received...Representative Hensel. Mr. Hensel?

119th Legislative Day

- Question is on 115 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3548 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "I noticed on 3539 I pushed the wrong button. I wish to be recorded as 'no'."
- Speaker McPike: "Let the record reflect the Gentleman would have voted 'no' on House Bill 3539. House Bill 3549, Representative Ryder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3549, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Commerce Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriates \$24,084,000 for the ordinary contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. That is not GRF, but it is from dedicated funds."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109 'ayes', 5 'nos'. House Bill 3549 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3646. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3646, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Office of the Secretary of State.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "I am proud to ask the General Assembly to appropriate \$251,500...and, no, I'm sorry...\$251,547,000 for the Office of the Secretary of State for fiscal year 91."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- this Bill there is 115 'ayes', no 'nays'. House Bill 3646 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3727. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3727, a Bill for an Act to amend the General Obligation Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. This would reduce it by one dollar. On House Bill 3727 I ask for you vote. This is the one Mr. McCracken was probably looking for."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those
 in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative
 Ryder."
- Ryder: "Just to indicate that this is the General Obligation Bond vehicle for those who are of interest."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 70 'ayes', 44 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 3727 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3760, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3760, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Community College Board.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would appropriate \$500 thousand for the Family Resource Development Center at the State Community College of East St. Louis. I ask for your 'aye' vote to pass 3760."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall...Representative Stephens." Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an interesting

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

appropriation, Representative. Tough as it is to balance the budget, tough as it is to pay for programs that we have, that have been in place or put in place this year, why is that we would want to fund a program that the substantive language has been defeated twice on this House floor?"

- Leverenz: "It's a good idea. And we want to make sure that the appropriation Bill was there. As a matter of fact, I believe that the substantive Bill might pass...In the alternative...In the alternative then if the appropriate substantive language does not pass, then the appropriation Bill will not be used for this purpose...So I would just ask for your..."
- Stephens: "I would...Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I would object to spending \$500 thousand of state tax dollars for a program that does not exist. We, absolutely, on this side of the aisle stand opposed to spending money we don't have in the first place, and secondly, spending money we don't have for program we don't have is even worse."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 60 'ayes', 50 'nos', and Representative Black is look...seeking a verification."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis votes 'aye'.

 Representative Ewing votes 'no'. Representative Wyvetter
 Younge...the Lady would like to vote 'aye'. Representative
 LeFlore 'aye'. Any further? Representative Krska 'aye'.

 Representative Leverenz asks a Poll the...Poll those not voting."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting: Capparelli and Stange.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

No further."

- Speaker McPike: "Proceed with the Verification of the Affirmative."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Flinn. Flowers. Gialio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahev. Munizzi. Novak. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite would like to be verified, Mr. Black. Ward."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to explain my vote before we start the process, with your indulgence. I think there are some people who think this is the community college appropriation Bill, that is not the case..."
- Speaker McPike: "Explain your vote? Representative Black, I don't think this is the appropriate time to explain your vote."
- Black: "You're probably right...I'm sorry. Alright. Thank you.

 We'll proceed with the verification. Representative

 Richmond?"
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Richmond? Representative Richmond? He's not here. Remove him from the Roll."
- Black: "Representative Van Duyne?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Van Duyne? Gentleman is not here. Remove him from the Roll."
- Black: "Representative Keane?"

119th Legislative Day May 17, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane? Jim Keane? Gentleman is

not here. Remove him from the Roll."

Black: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronan? Mr. Al Ronan? Is he here? Remove him from the Roll."

Black: "Representative Curran?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran? Representative Curran? Gentleman is not here. Remove him from the Roll."

Black: "Representative LeFlore?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative LeFlore? Is here."

Black: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin? Is here. Representative Ronan has returned. Put him on as an 'aye' vote...Representative Curran has returned. Put him on as an 'aye' vote."

Black: "Representative DeJaegher...Representative Williams?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams? Is here."

Black: "Representative Giorgi?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi? Is here."

Black: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeLeo is here."

Black: "Representative Dunn?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn...is here."

Black: "I can't see. Representative Balanoff?"

Speaker McPike: "Who?"

Black: "Balanoff?"

Speaker McPike: "Balanoff? Representative Balanoff? Mr. Balanoff?"

Black: "Representative Trotter?"

Speaker McPike: "Wait a minute...I'm still on Balanoff."

Black: "I'm sorry."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Remove Representative Balanoff from the Roll. Representative Bowman. Mr. Black,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Bowman is here. He'd like to be verified. Proceed, Sir."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Trotter?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter? Representative Novak would like to be verified. Representative Trotter? Mr. Trotter? Gentleman is not here. Remove him."

Black: "Representative Rice?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Rice? Mr. Rice here?
Representative Rice? He is not here. Remove him.
Representative Keane has returned. Put Mr. Keane on as an 'aye' vote. Representative Balanoff has returned. Return him to the Roll as an 'aye' vote."

Black: "Representative Edley?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Edley? Mr. Edley?

Representative Edley? Gentleman is not here. Remove him from the Roll."

Black: "Representative Breslin?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin? Representative Breslin? Lady here? Remove her from the Roll."

Black: "Nothing further, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative LeFlore. Representative LeFlore, you're recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Black, did you say nothing further?"

Black: "Nothing further, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Capparelli? Representative Capparelli? Alright. Representative Edley has returned. Return Representative Edley to the Roll. Representative Breslin has returned. Return Representative Breslin as an 'aye' vote. Representative McNamara changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. On this Bill there are 60 'ayes', 50 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3760 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Goforth, for what reason

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

do vou rise?"

- Goforth: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've done such a fine job and saved us a lot of time, why don't we take a fifteen minute break so you can go back and have a smoke and a cup of coffee."
- Speaker McPike: "We're going to do that. Alright.

 Representative Leverenz on a Motion. Representative Ryder,
 for what reason do you..."
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I just want you to know that I have some birthday cake over here. If you'd all like to come over, I'd be glad to share it with you. Could we call the State Fire Marshall? I'm a little concerned about this."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz on a Motion."
- Leverenz: "I think the Gentleman should blow it out, before it blows him out. On the Motion I would ask leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to extend the deadline to June 30 on House Bill 3265, 3266, 3269 and 3270."
- Speaker McPike: "The numbers on those were House Bills 3265,
 House Bill 3266, House Bill 3269 and House Bill 3270. The
 Gentleman's Motion was to extend the Third Reading deadline
 on these four Bills through June 30th, 1990. Any
 objections? Hearing none the Attendance Roll Call will be
 used and the Motion carries. Representative Olson."
- Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Republicans request a conference in Room 118 immediately and it will be a lengthy conference so that the Democrats can have lunch at any place in town they chose...but we're not picking up the tab."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson, how much time do you need?

 A half hour? Two hours. Representative Olson.

 Representative Olson. Let's have a little attention.

 Representative Olson, two hours is very unreasonable."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Olson, M.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a number of things..."

Speaker McPike: "We have...we have scheduled a Session tonight until 10:00 p.m. instead of 7:00 p.m. until...so we can get through this Calendar and in the middle of this you ask for a two hour recess. Can't you be more reasonable?"

Olson, M.: "How about an hour forty-five minutes? How about an hour and a half and we'll move it right along, Mr. Speaker.

How many on the Democratic side want a two hour conference?

I'll go with your majority, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "We'll do our best. Why don't we say an hour?"

Speaker McPike: "An hour...Right. Alright. We'll try to get back in one hour. It's now ten til 11:00. We hope to see you back at ten til 12:00. House will stand in recess for an hour for the Republican caucus in Room 118."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "That means the Democrats can go to lunch?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Leverenz would like to invite all the Democrats to lunch at Baur's."

Leverenz: "I have Representative McPike's American Express card.

Let's go."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen...Ladies and Gentlemen. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will come to order. going to start at Professional Regulations -Reading. House Bill 2074, Representative Kubik. Do you wish to proceed on this Bill on Second Reading? Out of the record. The next order of business is the Order of Banking, Second Reading. Banking - Second Reading. There's only one Bill on this order. Representative Cowlishaw is the Sponsor. House Bill 1679. Representative Cowlishaw? Out of the record. Banking, Third Reading. The Sponsors are: Tony Young, Ellis Levin, Monique Davis. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you are in your offices,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

return to the House floor. As we are ready to prepare...to proceed with all the Bills that are before us today. I see none of the Sponsors are here on this order of business. And I have to tell you we may not return to these orders, so please come to the House floor, so that we can proceed. The next order is Pensions, Second Reading. First Bill, House Bill 3692, Representative Wolf. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3692, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "No Floor Amendments? Representative Wolf, what is your pleasure?"
- Wolf: "Madam Speaker, has the fiscal note been filed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you answer that question?"
- Clerk Leone: "There is no fiscal note on file. There is a pension impact note."
- Wolf: "I was given to understand that the fiscal note had been filed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Has one been requested? It has been requested. They'll do a search to see if we can find it. Representative Wolf, the fiscal note has not been filed. The request was filed by Representative McCracken. me, Mr. McCracken. The question of the Chair is whether or not you still persist in the need for a fiscal note on this Pension Bill. The Pension Mandate's Note has been filed. That's enough. Representative McCracken indicates he will withdraw his request for a fiscal note, therefore, the Bill can move to Third Reading. Representative Wolf, you can proceed with the Bill right now, if you wish? He does. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill on Third. 3692."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3692, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "Madam Speaker, House Bill 3692 as well as the four succeeding Bills, 3228, 29, 3327 and 3505, are vehicle Bills for the purpose of addressing changes in the various pension systems. These Bills are intended to be structured to go into conference committee. And I would ask for adoption of House Bill 3692."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3692 and on that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3692 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye',. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Pensions, Third Reading. Appears House Bill 3228, Representative Wolf. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3228, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, this Bill as well the succeeding three Bills are vehicle Bills for Pensions and are being structured to go into conference committee. And I would ask for passage of House Bill 3228."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked for passage of House Bill 3228. And on that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "This is a Democrat Pension Vehicle. We can't let this move. Does this take seventy—one votes to pass?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "No."

McCracken: "I wonder who's over there?"

Wolf: "Representative McCracken, all of these Bills are completed in conference committee. They were on an Agreed Bill basis, and I'm sure you're aware of that."

Speaker Breslin: "On the question, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "How many of these pension vehicles do we have?"

Wolf: "We have five."

Cullerton: "Are any of them in the Senate yet?"

Wolf: "One."

Cullerton: "Okay. To reiterate, Speaker, what Representative Wolf just said, the way the pension system has worked here: it's been extremely bipartisan, in fact it's probably best example of bipartisan effort. What we do is, we put every Bill on conference committee, and we sit down at end of the year, usually Representative Wolf and myself. Representative Saltsman, Representative Hoffman on the Republican side, Senator Emil Jones, and a Representative of the Republicans in the Senate, usually Cal Schuneman, and we basically say if we can't all agree on it, it doesn't go in the Bill. So, this is just a...now if this is something other than a shell, then...maybe we can debate But if its intent is simply to follow that process, I don't think there should be a problem."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, the Sponsor has indicated that this Bill is a shell, as are the others that will follow. So, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3228 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye',. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

voting 'aye', 14 voting 'no' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3229. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3229, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I would just for the passage of House Bill 3229 for the same reasons as the preceding Bills."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3229 and one that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3229 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye',. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 78 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no' and 9 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3327. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3327, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I would ask for passage of House Bill 3327 for the same reasons as the preceding Bills."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3327 and on that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3327 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye',. Those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 voting 'aye'...93 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no'

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3505. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3505, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I would ask for passage of House Bill 3505 for the same reasons as the preceding."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3505 and on that question, is there There being none, the question is, 'Shall discussion? House Bill 3505 pass?' All those in favor vote 'ave'. those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On question there are 99 voting 'ave'. 8 voting 'no' and 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. next Order of Business, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the Order of Elections, Third Reading, Representative Stern is the Sponsor of these Bills. You are the Sponsor of the next Bills, Representative Stern on this Order of House Bill 3824. Clerk, read the Bill." Business.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3824, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 3825. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3825, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 3826. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. The next Order of Business, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the Order of Revenue,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Third Reading. Excuse me, the next Order of Business is Housing. Is Representative Capparelli in the chamber and Representative McNamara? Representative Capparelli or McNamara, please be in your seats. If you have Bills on this Order, Ladies and Gentlemen, we can't guarantee that we will come back to these orders. We're on Housing. Housing. Representative Capparelli and McNamara have Bills on this Order. The next Order is Revenue, Third Reading. The Sponsors are Representative Homer's, Ronan...the Sponsors are Homer, Ronan, Hicks, Currie and Bowman. The first Bill is House Bill 2872. Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2872, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the transfer of funds by taxpayers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Madam Speaker. Here's a chance in 2872 to do something that we don't often have an opportunity to do. That's increase the revenue for the State of Illinois by \$2 million without raising anyone's taxes. Now, how do we do that? We do that by virtue of taking advantage of modern banking technology. To required large taxpayers owing obligations to the State of Illinois, defined as an obligation of \$20,000 or more, to electronically transfer that obligation to the Treasury on the date that it's due instead of simply putting the check in the mail. The issue here has to do A term known in the banking industry as who with float. gets to take advantage of the money on deposit during the changing of hands in the transaction. Currently, that advantage is not incurring to the benefit of our state treasury, where it should. By requiring the electronic transfer or in the alternative the personal delivery of the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

obligation to the state treasury on the day that it is due, we will realize a minimum, according to the fiscal note, of two million dollars additional revenue in the state treasury, which will be available for education and other vital state's services. All that we're doing is providing for the taxpayers of Illinois the advantages of modern banking technology, that is already being used in the private sector so as to let the taxpayer in the public also take advantage of these measures. So, I think this is a win—win proposal. I would urge everyone to support it. It's two million more dollars a year for the state without raising any taxes, and it's a good public policy, good government, good accountability measure. I would urge support for House Bill 2872."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 2872 and on that question, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Countryman: "Representative Homer, it sounds like a pretty good idea, but do we do the same thing then if owe a taxpayer more than \$20,000? Does it require us to electronically wire it back to them?"
- Homer: "No. No, there is...there is...you know, there is no due dates. This is in effect, Representative Countryman, because there are specific dates by which taxpayers owe an obligation to the state treasury. I don't know of the opposite situation, where there is some date by which the state owes an obligation to someone else, do you?"
- Countryman: "Well, I know I had a constituent call me and he overpaid his sales tax by forty thousand dollars (\$40,000).

 And wanted me to help him get it back. And I wasn't

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

terribly optomistic to him, if you know there is a...some obligation that we owe, it seems to me if we are requiring people to pay one way, we're...we're now issuing checks back to them, if we...if we require somebody to pay an obligation that they owe, by electronic transfer, we ought to pay it back to them if we owe an obligation and pay it back to them."

Homer: "Well, I'm sure with your influence with the Department of
Revenue all you would have to do is call them and
facilitate it on behalf of your constituent."

Countryman: "I don't think that's quite the..."

Homer: "Oh, that's right. Wait a minute. You're a lame duck though. That's right."

Countryman: "But, one other question. How about the individual taxpayer, who may have some year done fairly well and needs to send a sum this large. Does an individual have to do this, or is this just the corporations?"

Homer: "Representative Countryman, it pertains to any...any taxpayer that owes any...any payment of more than \$20,000 (twenty thousand dollars) so, it's... I think it's pretty clear that it applies only to the large taxpayers of state and would not...you know there are not very many individuals who owe the state \$20,000 in any installment for any tax obligation. So, I can't imagine it would apply to any individual, but if it does, the Bill has an alternative provision to say that as an alternative to electronic transfer, the other option is to hand deliver it in to the Office of the State Treasurer...in to the Department of Revenue by the due date. And there are Revenue Offices throughout the State of Illinois. And the Bill says that the...the payment is delinguent if not received by the due dates. So, even if they use the mail. they send it enough days in advance, wanted to take

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

their chances if it got to the Department of Revenue before the due date, they would have no liability under this statute."

- Countryman: "So, you're saying they could write the check on the 20th of the month, if it's due on the 25th and they could then mail it and if it got there by the 25th they're fine, but if the mails don't get it there, then they're going to be delinquent and pay the penalties, right?"
- Homer: "That's right. If they want to be absolutely sure, they should either electronically transfer it or hand deliver it, but if they want to trust Uncle Sam, they can put it in the mail enough in advance and they could maybe call Revenue that day to see if it arrived, and if it didn't send it by courier. I don't think you're going to find many cases where that's going to be a problem."
- Countryman: "Well, I wish them a lot of luck calling the Department of Revenue. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
 McCracken."
- McCracken: "I rise in opposition to the Bill. I...I...I don't think it's necessarily a bad idea, although it's...ironic that we would require the use of wire transfers to receive our money, when we stall on tax refunds as long as we do. The Bill is opposed by the Department of Revenue. opposed by the Illinois Banker's Association. And it's opposed by Citicorp. It's opposed by CIPS. And apparently the affected parties are in the course of something along these lines and would like to have the opportunity to do so comprehensively rather than having to react to the piecemeal legislation. For that reason I rise in objection and ask my colleagues to join me. I really think this is the type of proposal that should be worked out by the affected parties on a comprehensive basis."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Surely."

Harris: "Representative, do you know...does the Comptroller now use electronic funds transfers when sending out payments, which the state may owe?"

Homer: "I wouldn't think so."

Harris: "Is there a particular reason why not?"

Homer: "Well, again, you know, Representative Countryman, asked this same sort of question, that you know if a payment is not due someone on a fixed date, why would electronically transfer it. The problem in delay...yes, there is a problem in paying obligations we problem is not in terms of the delay in the mail and the float on the money. The problem is the administrative part of putting the obligation in the form of a voucher, which is then authorized to be paid. That's where the delay is, so, you know you have a...a two month delay in getting the authorization. The voucher prepared and Why would you then, now that you've gotten that use electronic transfer to shorten by two extra days a four month delay. I mean, it just doesn't make any sense."

Harris: "Well, I understand what you're saying. Let me give you an example and to the Bill. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I happen to think that the Gentleman's idea's а very good one. Electronic transfer... Electronic funds transfer takes advantage of the technology, which is available to us today. Nothing wrong with that. We ought to be able to receive the money in as fast as we possibly can. But if we get the money in as fast as we possibly can, then it's only fair that we send the money out to those people to whom we owe money if they

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

have the capability of receiving an electronic funds transfer, that they get those funds. Let me give you a in point. The Job Training Partnership Act authorized...private industry councils in various locations around this state as you well know. Private Industry Council of Northern Cook County actually missed a payroll...actually missed a payroll because the which are simply pass through funds from the Department of Labor, which comes through DCCA and are simply through to the Private Industry Council. They missed...the Northern Cook Private Industry Council payroll because the check 'was in the mail'. Indeed the check was in the mail, but the Private Industry Council had the capability of receiving electronic funds transfer, why have not sent them an electronic funds transfer? Let me tell you why. Because the Comptroller says doesn't have the legal authority to do it. Let me also tell you, that I have sponsored Bills in this House to give him that authority. One of my distinguished colleagues...a former colleague, who...is now a Cook Countywide office holder, Representative Carol Mosley Braun sponsored a Bill in this House to do exactly that...authorize Comptroller to use EFT to get the money out. It's fair. Representative, I happen to think your Bill is good. happen to think it's a good idea, but it would be a heck of a lot better, if we said, hey, let's do it the other way, too. I offer that for your consideration. Perhaps you might want to work for that in the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson." Olson, M.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Olson, M.: "Representative Homer, do all banks currently have electronic transfer in house?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Homer: "I don't, no, I don't think so. I don't, I don't really know the answer to that but I don't believe all banks have..."

Olson, M.: "I don't think they do. And if all banks do not have electronic transfer in house, then would this, would your proposal work? Wouldn't there be some unfairness in it across as far as people owing funds to the state? Paying the state?"

Homer: "I think what the taxpayers, you know, let me first of all say, the Bill as amended you know, when it was first filed, Representative Olson, had a threshold of 10 thousand. Now we've kicked it up to 20 thousand and I think there are only like 250 of the largest taxpayers in the state that would be affected by this Bill now. Those large taxpayers do business, I would submit, with other than the rural country banks that you and I have in our district. And so as a practical matter I think you know, that the big commercial banks are well equipped and have been for some time with this technology. If there was anyone of those large taxpayers that banked with a bank that didn't, I would think all they'd have to do is make arrangements with some other bank for this one purpose of wiring the money."

Olson, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this particular measure. And I would urge my colleagues to do the same. I think the Gentleman does have a pretty good idea. However, I think the idea is a little bit before it's time. The Department of Revenue is currently working to create a system where all taxes would be, potentially be transferred in this manner. This particular Bill only, only, affects utility taxes and sales taxes. So my reason for opposition is I

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

think it makes a lot more sense if we can get department to get together and create a comprehensive program rather than a piecemeal program which we will unfortunately have to come back and amend in the future. So it makes a hell of a lot more sense to get everybody together and create a comprehensive program and solve that problem in that manner. So I would rise in opposition and would appreciate 'no' vote on this particular measure. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer is recognized to close." "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, you know, I'm really Homer: disappointed that there's any opposition to this Bill. mean we talk so much about accountability, about trying to increase the funding for education and vital state services and at the same time hold the line for taxpayers. got a proposal that admittedly, two million dollars doesn't solve all the problem of the state, but it's an effort and it's a sign to the taxpayers that we as the managers of their money are trying our best to find ways to cut waste and at the same time to be more efficient. That's message that the taxpayers have clearly sent to us. We have now a Bill that says by just implementing modern technology and better efficiency in streamlining government and the methods of collection we can accelerate the time in which monies that are owed to the state end up in the State Treasury drawing interest. That's all this Bill says. doesn't penalize any taxpayer, doesn't accelerate any dates that any payments are due. It just says, if there's going these monies, why not give it to the to be float on taxpayers. That's the request of this Bill. That's all it says and it's difficult for me to understand how anyone could have opposition to that idea. Which is long overdue. would urge that we show our constituents that we are

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- accountable, we're trying to be efficient and put up a lot of 'yes' votes on this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 2872. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative McGann, one minute to explain your vote."
- McGann: "Yes. I rise in support of this legislation. I think it's very, very important. We cannot depend upon the Department of Revenue to collect these monies. Here we have an opportunity to have the dollars come in quicker. If we had it in the past years we wouldn't be in debt...over 300 million dollars that belong to the State of Illinois. I urge a lot more of green votes up there."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Next Bill, House Bill 2923, Representative Ronan. Mr. Ronan in the Chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 3152, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3152, a Bill for an Act to amend the Retailers Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd ask leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3152..."
- Homer: "No. Madam, Madam Speaker, I ask leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. For an Amendment."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "I'm sorry. The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second, for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Hearing no objection. Are there any Amendments filed Mr. Clerk?"

 Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Hartke."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke on Amendment 1."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #1 amends the, amends this Bill and puts some corrective language in for the Enterprise Zone Act to cover the process of graphic arts production and I would appreciate your support on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 3152. On this question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
 Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Kubik: "Representative Hartke, could you explain this Amendment again please? I mean, my understanding that this Amendment would, would, amend the Enterprise Zone Act and give certain tax benefits to printers and graphic art production people?"
- Hartke: "That's correct, Representative. At the present time in the Enterprise Zone it talks about manufacturing and it's tax incentives but the graphic arts industry is considered manufacturing for some reason or the other. When the Enterprise Zone Act and so forth was established in Illinois and through commitments made with Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to a local printing industry they were committed to giving these tax incentives. Now they find out because of a guirk in law that they do not qualify. The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs who made that commitment

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

industry and now they're asking for the state to live up to that commitment."

Kubik: "My understanding in, under this Amendment that printers located in the Enterprise Zone would not be required to pay taxes, or sales tax on repair and replacement parts, fuel, equipment and supplies used in the process of graphic art production. Is that correct?"

Hartke: "Right. They're exempt right now. That's what I'm trying to correct so that those types of are included in this as part of the manufacturing."

KubiK: "And this particular Amendment would result in a net loss of sales taxes for the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Hartke: "That could be, Representative. Simply because we done the same thing for other manufacturers to encourage business establishment in these Enterprise Zones and job creation."

Kubik: "Madam Speaker, to the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Rubik: "I would simply rise in opposition to the Amendment. The Amendment does reduce the amount of sales tax that the State of Illinois will take in. It is my understanding in talking to the Department of Revenue we're talking about a reduction in at least a million dollars in sales tax revenue with this particular Amendment. I don't think this is the time to be looking at ways to reduce sales tax revenue in this current climate in our state. Let let's defeat this Amendment and I would not only ask for your opposition but would ask for a Roll Call vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Black: "Representative the fact of Amendment 1, are you giving this sales tax exemption only if a new graphic arts company would be moving into the Enterprise Zone? Or making substantial additions or improvements to their operation in the zone?"

Hartke: "That's as I understand it. World Color Press went with the commitment to expand their operation not only in every end but in Salem Illinois. And with this commitment there was an understanding with the Commerce of Community Affairs that they would qualify for many of these incentives. And now we find out that they do not and in speaking with the director those companies had received the understanding that they would receive those tax incentives and now he can't deliver and I'm asking this General Assembly to fix this quirk in the Enterprise Zone Act and to grant them that incentives. You know they've created those jobs and built those buildings and put the equipment in with the understanding that they would get this incentive and now we're backing out and I don't think it's quite right."

Black: "Thank you Representative. Madam Speaker, t.o the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Obviously, the Representative is trying to do something that he feels is vital to his district. But if you'll carefully read the Amendment, it appears that any, any graphic arts facility in any, located in any Enterprise Zone in the State of Illinois would not be required to pay sales tax on repair and replacement parts, fuels, equipment, supplies used in process of graphic arts production. the This is significant revenue loss. I can appreciate what the Gentleman's trying to do. I think the Amendment might go beyond what he is attempting to do and it's interesting to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

note that DCCA has not, evidently, signed on in support of the Amendment. So I think it needs a little more work and until that work is done I would reluctantly rise in opposition of the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Ι reluctantly rise in opposition to the Amendment. The point of it is to substantially expand the definition for exemptions from sales tax collections. I think it's presidential value would be enormous and would be very expensive in the long run to the State of Illinois. We particular Amendment, for this particular know this company, one particular company would cost our treasury at least a million dollars on an annual basis. don't know what effect it will have on the other units of government in the area where this company also pays sales taxes, but I'm concerned that the schools in this district not find themselves not having to rely ever more heavily on us to bail them out when their local dollars won't make the match. So I would urge opposition to this Amendment, I think it is not a timely proposition."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."

McGann: "Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I also rise in opposition to this Amendment. We just got through voting a sales tax reform just a year ago. Let's give it an opportunity to work. Let's not let it be costing state government as it will well over a million dollars in this case. We must be accountable in this year and the years to come. Let's vote this Amendment down."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Granberg: "Representative Hartke, when you made me aware of this Amendment about an hour ago. Let me give hypothetical situation. World Color Press has a plant in my district threatening to close down this past year and move to Dyersberg Tennesee which would cause loss of 600 jobs directly contributed to that factory not including the sit-off on the economy for other local jobs. The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs came down to Salem and negotiated with World Color Press and in order to keep them in Salem they said they would give Salem Enterprise Zone. Now it's my understanding that that Enterprise Zone designation does not effect them and that's what this Amendment is trying to correct"

Hartke: "That's correct Representative. You know World Color Press is a big corporation but it's scattered all over Southern Illinois. ...Mount Vernon, Effingham, Salem and other areas. What effects one plant will effect them all. This is in an Enterprise Zone. It was a commitment made by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and I think they should live up to that commitment."

Granberg: "Okay. То the Amendment, Madam Representative Kubik and others, the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, and I find it almost ludicrous came down to a city in my district. They promised that city an Enterprise Zone destination to save 600 jobs from moving to the State of Tennessee. That company, in reliance upon the promise of the Department of Commerce and Affairs, stayed in Salem. They relied on that. Now our understanding is DCCA does not have a position on this Amendment because they might not be affected. Well I find that ludicrous. Either you make a promise and you stick to that commitment or you don't. You don't make companies

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

rely on to their detriment, on misrepresentations. Our communities have relied on that representation from DCCA and now it doesn't affect them. Are we gonna uphold our commitment on the state level or not? This may not be a good policy decision but our communities have relied on DCCA in this instance. Now we pull the rug out from under them. This is not fair. If we have a commitment, we live up to it. And I support Representative Hartke's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, amazing when you talk about all the jobs and we try to save jobs and as you've already heard, we've got a World Color Press Plant in Effingham, in Representative District, one that employs some thousand people. One in Representative Granberg's district in Salem, employs over 600 people, one happens to be in Mount Vernon, a brand new plant, built just three years ago, employs over a thousand people and they're talking about expanding that plant. They got one in Sparta Illinois that employs over 800 This one company alone that we're trying to do something here for employs nearly 5000 people in Southern It employs nearly 5000 people. And I think we talked about something here awhile back called Sears that was 6000 jobs. Now we're talking about 5000 jobs in Southern Illinois. It's not unreasonable what we're asking to do here. To try to clarify a problem that existed in the law that we just a few years ago Representative Brummer tried to correct and we thought we had it corrected. we were given assurances by DCCA it was corrected. I think it's silly to say now that we're going to jeopardize jobs in Southern Illinois."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke you're recognized to close."

Hartke: "Thank you, very much Mr. Speaker. My dear Members the Assembly. Madam Speaker. My dear Members of the General Assembly. I think it's important that we continue to have these manufacturing plants scattered throughout Illinois. It's great to have Sears, it's great Mitsibushi, but this provides jobs in all communities from a wide range people drive to these shops. And I think it's imperative that we live up to that commitment. This little change, I don't think is going to cost that million dollars overestimated by the Department of Revenue. Maybe half But I think it's imperative that we live up to that that. commitment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 he adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it and the Amendment fails. Representative Representative Kubik asks for a Roll Call. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. A simple majority is required for the adoption of the Amendment. Representative Regan, one minute to explain your vote."

Regan: "I would think that this is only a fair proposal Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Many times we do this. Too many times. Promises are made to the local communities and they're taken back. I don't think we should get in the habit of doing this time after time after time. We've did it with TIF and now we're doing it here. Let's get the green votes up there."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

the record. On this question there are 74 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Representative Homer, there has been a request from both sides that if an Amendment is adopted to a Bill today that the Bill be held until tomorrow for consideration. Is that acceptable with you?"

- Homer: "Yes, I have no problem with that. Is that the policy of all Bills?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes. That has been the request of all Members so that we have time to look at the Amendments. And it's a request of both sides. Are there any other Amendments on this Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Bill is House Bill...excuse me, the next Order of Business is the order of dinner. Most important order. We want a Roll Call on whether or not Members will be eating chicken or pizza this evening. Chicken or pizza? The question is not debatable. Ladies and Gentleman, the question is not debatable. Mr. Parke, you'll have to take, turn your light off. An inquiry of the Chair from Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, since your side of the aisle has gone to the 50/50 proposal I think it's only fair we go 50/50 on dinner."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is not debatable Ladies and Gentlemen. The question is, 'Shall we eat chicken or shall we eat pizza?' Vote green for chicken, vote red for pizza.

 Representative Ewing, for what reason do you rise?"
- Ewing: "Yea. Well Madam Speaker, there's so much noise, but it would be much easier to make a decision if we knew are we gonna have Browns, Colonel Sanders are we gonna have Gabatoni's? Who's providing this? I mean, the brand? We're very discerning people here."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "Or Domino's. Okay. I don't have any further information to give you Representative Ewing. Have all voted who wish? Oh, oh, the Chair of the Appropriations Committee is seeking recognition. Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Madam Speaker, those hanging out with me in 'present'

 I think we're for the swordfish with lemon butter. Who's buying?"

Speaker Breslin: "Have all... The House Trust Fund."

Leverenz: "There's an audit that should be conducted."

- Speaker Breslin: "...That was trust, not slush. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The issue is so close, Ladies and Gentlemen that we believe we can split the order 50/50. 50 percent chicken and 50 percent pizza and then everybody can have a little bit of both if they like. Okay? So that's the decision of the House. Thank you. The next Order is Representative, Representative Currie is recognized for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the, the deadline for consideration of House Bill 4050 until June 30th of this year."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to extend the deadline for House
 Bill 4050 until the end of the year, until June 30th. The
 Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken on that
 Motion."
- McCracken: "Thank you. To the Motion. I imagine the reason for this is so that the Amendments we have sought to, to attach to this Bill will not be considered if at all until the very last day of the session. We have attached a number of Amendments because that is our only possible vehicle for bringing to the Floor discussion of tax relief. There are no Republican Bills available for that purpose. None was let out of committee for that purpose. No Revenue Bill has

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

been called that we could have sought to have Amendments considered to. 4050 is one of those Bills. We rise in opposition to this Motion to extend the deadline. What are you afraid of? Why is it so painful to consider tax relief Amendments. If you don't like them you can vote them down. You're in the majority. All we want is a discussion and a vote. We don't have to win. That's not the rules of the game. We acknowledge that. But we want a vote. This is the people's forum. They should be hearing us discuss the #1 issue in the State of Illinois. Property tax relief. rise in opposition to this Motion. It's just a device to avoid the responsible thing to do. We want to be heard on this issue. We will not take it lying down. We object this Motion. I want a Roll Call vote. I will verify it regardless of how many Democrats are on this Motion. let's get started. We rise in opposition. We do not want this Motion to pass."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik." Kubik "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I too rise in opposition to this particular Motion. This Bill has been on the Calendar since the minute it's been out of committee, it's been on a Special Call, it's been passed over many, many times. We've had a number of opportunities to debate it. Amendments have been on your desk for at least two or three days. There is no secret to this Bill. We oughta debate this Bill. Let's debate it. Let's get the issue out there. The other Chamber seemed very comfortable with debating the whole issue of property tax reform. We oughta do it in this Chamber and we should do it now. I would oppose this Motion and I would also remind my members that not one Republican Bill, Revenue Bill, was let out of Revenue Committee. We ought to oppose this Motion. ought to go to this Order. And let's vote on the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Amendments now. That's the responsible thing to do. That's the right thing to do while we're on Third Reading Bills. So I would oppose this Motion and would urge all my colleagues on this side of the aisle to oppose it. And all of those responsible Democrats who see that the real issue that is facing us in this Session, is the whole issue of property tax reform, property tax limitation. Let's get it on the Table, let's discuss it, let's not wait until the last minute in an all or nothing kind of proposition. Let's debate it responsibly, and intelligently and let's do it now."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to take a moment introduce a special guest, Treasurer Cosentino. Is here at my left. Welcome back. The, he's walking with a cane Ladies and Gentlemen for the next week or so but he promises to throw it away soon. He'll, and be back soon. But he'll be down in his office for the rest of the day if anybody needs to see him."

Cosentino: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Everybody likes to know where the Treasurer is.

Okay. Thanks. The next person to be recognized is the

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and the Press. I hope that you are listening to what is being done here. You are not allowing the voice of the people to be heard on the most, the single most important issue in this Session. And that is property tax relief. In the Chicago Tribune today there's an article that says Madigan out to stop tax vote. Speaker Madigan is delibertly trying to make sure that there's no discussion and debate on tax issues in the Illinois House and therefore trying to styme the will of the people. I think this is a sinful approach to government. Not allowing the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

peoples voice to be heard. Having it heard on the last day of Session does not afford any opportunity for rebuttal, does not allow for any opportunity for public input in the process. This is a sham and an embarrassment to this body to the people of Illinois and I call upon Speaker Madigan to stand up and be counted and listen to the debate. Allow the debate and not allow this kind of sham to take place on the people of this state. And I hope the media starts hammering the Speaker on it's irresponsible approach to government. We cannot take this on the behalf of the people of the State of Illinois any longer."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Sinclair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "We can't hear you sir."

Flinn: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', and the Motion fails. Don't need to verify. It takes 2/3 to cut off debate. The Motion fails. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Only the slightest disagree of Republicans have spoken on this issue. The fact of the matter is, is this is the vote that talks about who in Illinois believes in tax relief. Who in Illinois wants to talk about giving the taxpayer's of this state a fair shake for a change? Who in Illinois really cares about who's carrying the freight? This is going to be a vote. I agree with them that we're not going to get a real chance to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

debate the real issue. But we will have a chance to put the real vote up here. Those of you on that side of the aisle who want people to have a fair shake in taxes, to get some relief, or at least some discussion about tax relief, will put green votes up there. Those of you who don't excuse me will put red votes up there. Those of you who don't believe in tax relief don't want to give the tax payer a break don't really care about who's carrying the freight in this state will pass this, this Motion to extend the deadline. It's a shame that the taxpayer's of Illinois can't expect more of their legislature than this limited debate that we have today. I think we ought to be ashamed at what's happening here."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Rep...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too, there are a couple of Amendments that I have on there that have to do with property assessment, reform an Cook County that gives Cook County, all property owners in Cook County the right that all the rest of the state has that would promote fairness and uniformity. It's got lots of support from lots of sources. I have support from many people on the other side of the aisle. people in this General Assembly who favor property assessment reform in Cook County. And fact is I think the Sponsor of this Bill has sponsored the kind of thing that I have on here as a form of Amendments in the past. need to discuss these issues and we need to determine, I mean, quadrant four in Cook County, there are a lot of tax It's a very big area. And so I think we need to address these things so we can promote and not only promote fairness, but know that the people in Cook County feel that we are really trying to go to bat for them.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

certainly would oppose this extension of deadline."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. hear a lot of noise from the other side of the aisle. didn't hear much noise from the other side of the aisle when we on this side of the aisle were working on circut breaker tax relief. When we were working on the Homestead Exemption Tax Relief. You know why we need more time? why we need more time to study tax relief? In the last 14 years Governor Thompson has put so many increases on the backs of people, we need more time to look at all those increases. We can't do it that quickly. has, he has raped the citizens of Illinois with regards That's your Governor. taxes. That's your side of the aisle. Those are your tax increases. Do all of you that Thompson Referendum? Don't all of you remember that phony deal? That wasn't а Democrat. That was a Republican. A Republican that had all those phony petitions telling the people of Illinois what he was going to do on tax relief. It's no wonder that the taxpayers don't trust you Republicans. It's no wonder after Governor Thompson pulled that act on tax relief and then in the next breath, after he won his election with that phony deal, all he did was tax you people. It's no wonder we need time. We've got to look at all those increases that he put on us and act deliberatively and give some real tax relief. We need more time."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House. The Democrats have been in the majority here for

eight years and without their votes there would not have
been any of those tax increases so don't try to blame it on

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

us. That's you, they're your propositions. You're the people that put the votes up there. We on this side of the aisle can't do anything without you and you know that. to blame it on Governor Thompson and the Republicans is absolutely ludicrous. Ιn Executive Committee we were stymied. We tried to get Bills out. Property Tax Relief. What happened? The Democrats got and walked out. We all know we can't pass anything without you. You've turned your backs on your own constituents. You will not listen to them. They are saying to you they want tax relief. We want tax relief votes. Both income tax and most especially property tax. You won't it for them. You should be embarrassed that your constituents are asking you for relief and you won't even it down here. If you don't like it, vote against But for heavens sakes, give them the right of being their Representative and discuss what it is that they would like you to do. And that is give them property tax relief. Put your vote up there. Let them see how you feel about it for heavens sakes let us discuss it here and let us discuss it now. Please vote 'no' on this Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "A half a million Illinois Citizens in the last two months signed a petition asking for tax relief and for an opportunity to be heard on tax relief. Speaker of the House and his minyan's have decided that that shouldn't be put to people and they've developed a strategy which apparently has enlisted the support of various other groups to knock the will of the people off the ballot. So we don't have an opportunity to talk about tax relief. We don't have an opportunity for the citizens to even speak on tax relief. That's not going to be an issue if the Speaker

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

has his way. And now, the only opportunity that Members of this Chamber have to legislatively address the issue of tax relief is also going to be taken away from us. extending this deadline until June 30th there is virtually no opportunity whatsoever to debate the real issue of 1990, and that is meaningful tax relief. So in effect. extending this deadline and by the actions of the Speaker in regard to the Tax Accountability Amendment, we're going to emerge from this Session with no opportunity whatsoever to talk about the beleaguered taxpayers of Illinois and they're right to have tax relief. So if that's what you want to do, if you want to deny the people an opportunity to be heard, if you want to deny the opportunity to discuss the issue of taxes and tax relief, then you should vote in favor of this Motion by Representative Currie. you believe as Republicans do and as Jim Edgar does that tax relief is a major issue. It's the major issue of 1990 and it's an issue that notwithstanding the efforts of the other side to cloud the issue is an issue that distinguishes these parties as much as any issue ever will, then you oughta vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson." Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. When we're discussing the Governor of the State of Illinois, I've been here long enough recognize a 'no' where the initiatives for new spending have come in the nine years that I've been here. here when the budget was 16 billion, now it's 27.5. Anytime you prepare a budget and offer something for appropriations, we get new grant requests from the other side of the aisle, which is the finish with the thought it's only 144 million. 150 million. This is a time to act responsibly. We're not looking back, we're

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

forward. We should vote 'no' on this Motion and get on with the business of the State of Illinois."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. to question the thinking of one of the individuals across aisle when they mentioned that the Governor the continuing to ask for increase taxes on the people of the State of Illinois. Might you all recall of the any number of programs that have come up I might say, from your side the aisle, that have attempted to do things that we already have in existence. As a result, those programs have passed and additional funds are required almost on an annual basis. The fact that this body will not address the needs of some 3500 young people who drop out of school, which require the construction of a new prison every year, is something that cannot continue to go unanswered. And it seems to me that when people of the State of Illinois want to be heard on taxes and how to spend, and now want to delay it, it's just something that is uncalled for. Now is the time to address these issues. Let's not put them off until the last week in June when maybe three or four people sit down and decide what we the legislative body needs to address, this body is sent down here in order to make those assessments. I think we're smart enough to respond to this concern right now without delaying it and allowing three or four or five people to make that decision. The people of the State of Illinois have sent us down here to do that. I'm willing to stand up and be counted on these issues now. I think it's time that the people of the State of Illinois get some tax relief on certain areas. Even though, there are people who say we need more and more programs and now do not want to address it and stand up."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Contrary to many of those who have spoken before me, I really do not regard the issue that will be voted upon shortly as a partisan issue at all. I think instead, that this is a fundamental issue about the form of government that we have in Illinois. The extent to which it is open government, the extent to which it is participatory government. And the extent in which we can encourage our citizens to take part in the decision making that is so important to all of them. Ιn fact, essentially and fundamentally the issue we are about to vote on boils down to a simple question for the Land of Lincoln. Is ours a government of the people, by the people, for the people, or is ours a government of Speaker, by the Speaker, for the Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's hard to follow that speech. That's exactly what's going on here though. I remember last year. The most disgusting year I've spent in Springfield. A tax and spend frenzy. Five new taxes last year. There was no question about holding back any of those Bills until the deadline date. All those Bills were called so you could vote on tax increases. Now they want to deal with property tax. No one wants us to deal with property tax relief. It just seems to be tax and spend as the way to go, no tax relief. Let's open up this issue and debate it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie is recognized to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I

got a little confused during the debate, wondering exactly

what Motion we were voting on. The Motion is to extend the

deadline so we can have the debate on property taxes that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

all of you so look forward to. Given this debate, the debate over this lousy little Motion, I can't imagine how lengthy that debate will be. There are 14 or 15 or 18 Amendments filed to date to House Bill 4050. If we want an opportunity to give them serious consideration, then the only sensible vote is to give us time to do that and extend the deadline for consideration of the Bill. You all know that you had a chance to vote for property tax relief in January. Many of you chose not to avail yourselves of that chance when you had it. I find it a little odd that you're carrying on now as if timelyness is the only issue. You all know that there is a property tax task force. bipartisan effort, including Republicans as well as Democrats. We are going to continue our work, should this Motion succeed, and work toward a bipartisan solution to property tax problems. One that can work for downstaters as well as upstaters. Ones that will be appropriate for people in urban areas as well as in rural territory. think if you're concerned to provide an opportunity to provide relief for your constituents, the only sensible vote on this Motion is a 'yes' vote. This is the only way you'll have the opportunity to provide that relief for your people back home."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, for what reason do
 you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Uh, a Parliamentary Inquiry Madam Speaker. House Rule 37(g) specifies the deadlines by which Bills must be passed on Third Reading. Subparagraph G specifies that any Bill not passed in accordance with those deadlines is automatically tabled. Any Motion to take from the Table requires 71 votes. Therefor this Motion to extend the deadline, that is otherwise avoid the effect of tabeling mandated by rule 37(g) is in a fact a Motion to take from

the table or tant amount to avoiding the tabeling. So that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- should require 71 votes. The reasoning is flawless. challenge the Parliamentarian to come up with something." Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, your point is not well taken. There is nothing in this rule, 37(q) that indicates that the deadline cannot be extended requiring more than the normal majority. So the question is. 'Shall the House extend the deadline on House Bill 4050?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative McCracken, one minute to...oh, for a verification. Only push your own switches. There will be a verification. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', and a verification will proceed. Are there any not voting? Poll those not voting, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Stange. Van Duyne. And White. No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "Leave to be verified has been requested by
 Representative Young and Representative Jones. Is that
 granted? That is granted. And Representative Novak. And
 Representative Lang. Those are granted. Proceed with the
 Poll of the Affirmative. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone "Poll of those voting in the affirmative. Balanoff.

 Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli.

 Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me Mr. Clerk. Representative Hartke asks leave to be verified. That is granted. Proceed."
- Clerk Leone: "DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Phelps. Preston. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Trotter. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Alright. Do you have any questions of the Affirmative Mr. Clerk, or rather Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "Yes. Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan? L. Ronan. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Mautino?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino, Bill Laurino, is in the chamber. Representative DeLeo asks leave to be verified.

That is granted."

McCracken: "Representative Satterthwaite? Oh, I see her.

Representative Monique Davis?"

Speaker Breslin: "She's in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker Breslin: "She was...had leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey, Dick Mulcahey. He was just here. Representative Dick Mulcahey. Is Representative Mulcahey in the chamber? He is...He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Rep..."

Speaker Breslin: "He has returned. Add him to the Roll Call

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

voting 'aye', Mr. Clerk."

McCracken: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Morrow. Charles Morrow. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Flowers?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative White?"

Speaker Breslin: "He's not voting."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 62 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present' and the Motion carries.

The next Order of Business is a Revenue Third Reading, continuing on that Order is House Bill 3153, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3153, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to state service use. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This House Bill would amend the Service Use and Service Occupation Tax Act. The Bill would create a rebuttable presumption that tangible personal property used in fulfilling maintenance agreements is less than 35 percent of a service providers total receipts. The Bill provides that in those instances where a service provider transfers tangible personal property in a maintenance agreement that a rebuttable fulfilling presumption shall exist, that the cost of such materials are less than 35 percent of the total receipts. Amendments #1 removed that provision and with Amendment #1 such tax payers could in fact pay a tax based upon the actual cost of materials that are included in the maintenance agreement. I don't believe the Bill controversial. I would try to answer questions. I offered

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

it...I've handled it at the request of the Illinois State
Chamber of Commerce and Caterpillar and others who utilize
large service maintenance agreements. And I would urge
support for the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 3153. And on that question is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3153 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3832, Mr. Hicks. Mr. Hicks, do you wish to call this Bill? Mr. Shaw, Mr. Hicks, do you wish to call this Bill? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3832, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. House Bill 3832 is Bill that we're trying to use to clean up the Motor Fuel Tax dealing with sales tax here in Illinois. Currently out of state trucking companies come in and buy motor fuel, or do not buy motor fuel in Illinois, have a two cent advantage by not buying motor fuel in Illinois. This corrects the inequity in that and allows the instate truckers to pay the same as out of state trucking companies if the tax on out of state people amounts to some seven million dollars gain in general revenue. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3832. This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Kubik, in opposition."

Kubik "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I rise in opposition to this particular proposal. I might point out that this does represent a tax increase. And it will be a tax increase of about 10.9 million dollars. I want the Members to know that this will be a tax increase. And I would oppose it on that measure. I think that this is not the year to be passing tax increases. I would urge your 'no' vote on this particular measure."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hicks is recognized to close."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, the Gentleman is exactly right. It is a tax increase. It's a some seven to ten million dollars of the tax increase on people who are getting around the law as we passed it last year. It's not a tax increase on one Illinois citizen. Let me say that again. It's not a tax increase on one Illinois citizen. It's a tax on people from out of state that have to pay a service charge for a service tax for purchasing fuel or for the advantage of not purchasing fuel in Illinois. Happy to try to..."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3832 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 68...66 voting 'aye', 40 voting 'no', and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3896, Representative Currie.
Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3896, a Bill for an Act to amend the Service Occupation Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3896 would apply to people engaged in the printing business in the State of Illinois. provisions with respect to sales tax obligations that this chamber adopted for pharmacists in January November. The printing industry was for reasons unclear to me was not a participant when legislature adopted major sales tax changes and reforms a year and a bit ago. the printing industry been at the table there's no doubt in my mind that printing issues would have been treated differently from the way they were in the ultimate Bill that was adopted by the legislature. The printing industry now comes to us and explains for reasons of competition. for reasons that have to do with various kinds of jobs that come into any individual printing shops and with the likelihood of how much work is performed in any given job, how much of that represents tangible property and how much represents actual labor which of course you know is of it exempt from sales tax collection. So the printing industry asks with this Bill to make the kind of change that we did make for the pharmacists and it is a proposal that would treat them at a 75 percent level, rather than the current 35 percent. I would be happy to answer any of your questions, and would appreciate your support measure."

Speaker Breslin: "The lady has moved for passage of House Bill 3896. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this particular measure. While I understand what the Lady is trying to do, you know, sales tax reform with no secret. Everybody was involved in it. I mean, I don't think it was a major secret in this

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

state that we were reforming our sales tax laws. So what do we do? We reform the sales tax law and immediately upon performing it we're back again making exceptions. We're making exceptions for pharmicists. We're making exceptions for printers. So now if we include the printing industry who's going to be coming through the door next? And what we're going to do, if we're going, within a few years is be back where we started. The point of sales tax reform was to make a clean understandable system. By adopting these kinds of measures, we're cluttering up the system, we're creating more problems in the sales tax area so I. well. I'm sure there are a lot of good reasons why we might to support this. The bottom line is that this is going to start encouraging more and more businesses and more and more industries to come in with these exemption. I would urge you to look at opposing this measure. And I haven't even talked about what the cost might be to the state. Ιn terms of the lost revenue in this particular Bill. revenue loss reasons, for sales tax reform reasons, we oughta be against this Bill. We ought to state it now and we ought to stick to the sales tax reform. My God, let's let it work for a couple years before we start rushing for exemptions. I would oppose this measure and would hope all would oppose it as well."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Harris, on the Bill."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Lady yield for questions?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Harris: "Representative, just for clarification, I didn't hear everything that you said. The board says graphic art production, or something along those lines. Is this the Bill that deals with printers and the percentage of how...?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Currie: "That's exactly right. This deals with printers."
- Harris: "Specifically we're dealing with printers. The exemption, this is not a new exemption, let's not use the word exemption. This is not a new category, we're simply changing the percentages somewhat, correct?"
- Currie: "It is not an exemption and in fact, the Department of Revenue says that the fiscal impact would be minimal. So it is not an exemption, it's just a different way of reporting their taxes."
- Harris: "Alright. So assuming there was someone paying the tax now, under the current...under the current percentage, we're giving a different percentage break so that considerably there might be some people not paying the tax under this new break. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "My guess is that the same people will be paying about the same amount whether we do it this way or do it the other. And that's what I think the department needs."
- Harris: "But if my assumption were correct, than this could almost be considered a tax decrease. Could it not?"
- Currie: "It could be except that the department tells us that they expect minimal impact and I take that to mean minimal."
- Harris: "Well. I was obviously trying to lead you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I understand the position of our Minority Spokesman on this. But I don't know about you, but I've heard from a lot of my printers in my district. This is a bureaucratic nightmare that they have gone through. I understand what we did with sales tax reform last year, but the paper work burden that we put on these people was unnessary, unfair, and it seems to me in need of change and revision. I think the Lady's got a good idea here and a good Bill and I certainly urge a passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Munizzi.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Did you, did you wish to address this Bill?"

Munizzi: "No I didn't, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I think that the issue has been well defined. We're not talking about any kind of revenue decrease. We are talking about helping our printers be economically competitive with printers in other states. We do make a difference to the sales tax reform through this revision and I think that is legitimate point. But I would say to you the fact that printers were not part of the discussions that led to that Bill, does not justify us in turning the back of our hands their way just in honor of something that is more matter of principal than practicle reality. So, on the horns of this dilemna, I would go with making sure that we cut out the bureaucratic red tape. Make sure that our printers can be economically competitive and hope that we haven't left a lot of other industries in the situation the printers found themselves in. So appreciate your support to House Bill 3896."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3896 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no'. and 1, 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4042. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4042. A Bill for an Act in relationship to information on the Federal Earned Income Tax Credit.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman. The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Bowman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 deletes one line in the Bill in the statement of the, or the form and statement of the notice that the Bill provides for. With this Amendment on the Bill, the employer community of Illinois withdraws it's opposition from the legislation and we can proceed currently with passing the legislation as amended. So I now move for adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 4042. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I would love to support this Amendment if Amendment #2 had gotten a fair hearing instead of being ruled out of order by some artful..."

Speaker Breslin: "Dodger."

McCracken: "I was at loss for words. I am disarmed by your candor. Amendment #2 talked about an Earned Income Tax Credit as well. But in my opinion was improperly ruled out of order. I think only as a device of voiding debate on the issue. Amendment #2 would have given an Earned Income Tax Credit to families with young children. It would have allowed mothers to stay home. It would have allowed the family to stay together. It represented a break with our bureaucratic tradition of institutionalized daycare and instead we don't get to debate the issue, we are left with is what is not much more than a technical Amendment, Amendment #3, and I think it is a terrible shame that in

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

this chamber anybody cannot get a hearing. Do vou know in the Senate they vote on all these issues? There's a rumor going around, and I've confirmed it, the Senate votes these issues. The Senate votes on tax accountability. The Senate votes on Earned Income Tax Credits. The Senate votes on Civil Procedure Tort Reform. Things we are not allowed to discuss. And I say it's time that we got the right to present our points of view as well. Amendment should have been considered. If it had been considered on the merits, it would have passed. And everybody in everybodies district, people and families would have been better off. So I don't really care what Amendment #3 does. it's inconsequential, with all due respect to my friend the Sponsor. The shame of this is that 2 has been passed over and not considered."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Does your records indicate that this Amendment has been distributed? I have #2 but I don't have #3."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you answer that question?"

Speaker Breslin: "It has been printed and distributed,

Representative. Representative Kubik, on the Amendment."

Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."
Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Kubik: "Representative, would you, would you, with all the commotion, I didn't hear. What does the Amendment actually do again? Would you briefly explain it?"

Bowman: "Well, Representative Kubik. If you have a copy of the Bill in front of you, on the bottom of page 2 in section 5 where it provides for the language of notice, there is in capital letters and quotation marks the exact language that the Bill requires employers to provide to their employees. What the Amendment does is to strike the phrase beginning

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

in line 33. The phrase now reads 'you may also ask your employer to pay the Earned Income Tax Credit in your paycheck in advance' that language would be striken. The employers would remove their opposition to this legislation if this one line were deleted. And so I'm prepared to delete it."

Kubik: "Then you do keep the language that follows that? 'You
must file a tax return to claim the income tax'..."

Bowman: "Yes, that remains in the Bill."

Kubik: "That remains in the Bill. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted'? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye' o voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present'. Representative Kubik, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Kubik: "Madam Speaker, did we adopt the Amendment?"

Speaker Breslin: "We adopted Amendment #3 just now."

Kubik: "That's what this vote was?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

Kubik: "Okav."

Speaker Breslin: "So Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Order of Business is the Third Reading, State Government Administration. That's Third Reading, State Government Administration. The Sponsors are Bugielski, Terzich, McGann, Terzich, Madigan, Currie, Giorgi, Ewing, Capparelli. The first Bill House Bill 890, Representative Bugielski. Out of the record. House Bill 2924, Representative Terzich. Clerk, read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2924, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yeah, Madam Speaker, I'd like to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Order, this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Terzich."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 is an Amendment which provides for a stypin for sheriffs that run jails in the State of Illinois. I move for it's adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the Adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2924. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Terzich."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Madam Speaker, I kind of screwed up on that one. Could we table Amendment #1 and adopt Amendment #2 which is the same thing, which was just corrected on a technical error?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 that
 was just adopted. Is there any objection? Hearing none,
 Amendment #1 is tabled. By unanimous leave. Amendment
 #2..."
- Terzich: "Two is the same Amendment."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Terzich moves the adoption of Amendment #2. And on that question, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hultgren: "Representative, I understood what you said for the Amendment. How does that affect the underlying Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "How does the Amendment affect the underlying Bill?"

Terzich: "Well, it deletes everything after the enactment."

Speaker Breslin: "It becomes the Bill. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 3042, Representative McGann. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 19 of the calendar, House Bill 3042, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

House Bill 3042, that's an exemption for students, commuter students, who do not reside on a campus or in a university supported housing facilities. I'd ask for support and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann the Clerk advised me, advises me that Amendments have been filed to this Bill.

Been filed by you. Did you want to go forward with those Amendments? No."

McGann: "No."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3042. And on the question, the Gentleman from Cook,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Piel. Excuse me, the Lady from Cain, Representative Doederlein."

Doederlein: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I again rise in opposition to this Bill. There were some comments made when we debated this before that there was not enough serum to go around. Well, when you have an emergency that serum disappears quite quickly. We now have enough serum, Representative McGann and I think we can take care of that. I do think that this is a good public health rule and I think we should not dilute the regulations by amending the commuter students out of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave, since this Bill has been debated before and we know what it does, I will go directly to a vote on the Bill and then allow everyone to speak that wishes to speak in explanation of vote. If that is acceptable. This is something we've had a vote on before. Representative McGann to close, briefly."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Previous Speaker's once again in error on the part as far as enough serum because it has not happened. Also there's just as much exposure for a person taking one hours or two hours or those for religious reasons and they are exempt. All we're asking for is exemption of commuter students. We do exempt the community college students which are tenfold more than what you would have exposure from the 60 approximately 70 thousand students in the commuters versus approximately 600 and some or 800 and some thousand community college students. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3042 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. Representative Ropp, one minute to explain

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- your vote."
- Ropp: "Well, Madam Speaker. I was just gonna ask a question and maybe the Sponsor. I asked a question in debate before the Sponsor has since found the answer. I would like for him to in his explaining of his vote give the answer to my question relative to numbers and because of those numbers I'm voting 'yes' this time. Where I was voting 'no' before."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel.

 One minute to explain your vote. Representative Piel, do
 you wish to speak?"
- Piel: "No, I was just gonna ask the Gentleman after making your explanation of your vote, you can tell me how the Bill got so much better in the last 24 hours. We killed it 24 hours ago and I was just curious if he would explain his explanation to vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann, do you wish to answer the questions?"
- McGann: "Yep. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that the membership believes in equity. This is an equity approach to a Bill. And that is what has happened. Thank you for all of your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Doederlein, you already spoke once. For what reason do you seek recognition? She wishes to verify. The question is...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present'. Representative Doederlein has requested a verification. Poll the absentees Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Leverenz. And Stange."

 Speaker Breslin: "Poll the Affirmative please."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Bowman. Breslin.

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli. Cullerton. Curran. Daniels. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Didrickson. Dunn. Edley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Hoffman. Homer. Hultgren..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Shaw asks
 leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Nod your head.
 Representative Shaw. Yes, leave is granted. Proceed Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kirkland.

 Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Martinez. Matijevich.

 McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McNamara. McPike.

 Morrow. Munizzi. Novak. Parcells. Phelps. Preston.

 Rice..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Wyvetter Young asks leave to be verified. And that is granted. Proceed Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Richland. Ronan. Ropp. Saltsman. Santiago.
 Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich.
 Turner. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Wolf. Woolard.
 Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Piel: "Well, obviously there's been some deal made which I was not privy to it must have gotten good all of a sudden and I figure seeing so many people over here have changed to green and there's something going on why don't you change me to green also?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Change Representative Piel to 'aye'.

 Representative Piel votes 'aye'. Representative Barnes

 votes 'aye'. Representative Doederlein do you persist with

 your verification? She does not. On this question there

 are 69 voting 'aye', 40 voting 'no', and 6 voting

 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3426, Representative Terzich. Mr. Terzich. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3426, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "One more time, Madam Speaker, I'd like to bring it back to Second."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill back to the Order of Second for the purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Terzich."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1 so we may adopt Amendment #2. No, I'm sorry. Table Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment 1 is tabled. Any further Amendments? Amendment 2, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yeah, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 is simply to bring the Bill into a Constitutionality provision. Which by deleting out a statement, I would move for it's adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3426. On the question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Well the analysis says that this limits the scope of the Bill to instate waste produce from dye and ink only.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Is that correct?"

- Terzich: "I'm removing that stipulation on Amendment #2. I'm just simply stating from..."
- Speaker Breslin: "He's tabeling #1, adopting #2. Relates to out
 of state waste only."
- McCracken: "Okay. Well, now, well, I'll wait until Third Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 3613, Representative Madigan Cullerton. Representative Cullerton. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3613, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Home Ownership Made Easy Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3613 contains the State Treasurer's suggested clean up changes to the recently adopted the Home Ownership Made Easy Program, which I think was sponsored by yourself Madam Speaker, last year. This Bill prohibits an eligible home owner from having an ownership interest in residential real estate during participation in the program. It raises the number of dwelling units that comprise residential real estate from two to three. It revises the treasurer's investment options, by retaining only a home investment pool. And providing authority to offer other investments. Of course 20 percent of all funds in the home investment pool be invested in Illinois banks and S&L's only after the pools balance exceeds 10 million

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

dollars. Provides also that the income earned on all home investments would be exempt from State Income Tax makes optionally requirements that the IDA issue, that IDA issue, the Illinois Housing Development Authority issue home bonds that the Treasurer must purchase. It allows a participant to obtain with the Treasurers approval month extension to acquire a home and finally deletes the requirements that nearly net deposits over a three year or five year participation period it leaves 20 percent or 10 percent respectively of the total amount deposited by the participant. As you can see it's merely technical and I move for its passage."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 3613. On the question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "This Bill, other than some of the technical changes gives the treasurer increased discretion over how to invest the money. Is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "Yes. It revises the Treasurers investment options by retaining only a home investment pool in providing authority to offer other investments. The purpose of that is to give the treasurer greater flexibility which will, presumably provide a greater return to the participants."
- McCracken: "Okay. I hope he does not have the discretion to invest or deposit into noninterest bearing accounts. Is it your understanding of the Bill that that would not be available to the Treasurer?"
- Cullerton: "Well, I certainly agree with you on that hope. I would have to look at the Bill to see if that is specifically spelled out, but certainly that would not provide a greater return to the participants."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3613 pass?'

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Dunn, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd just like the record to show that it would have been my intention to vote 'yes' on House Bill 3153."

Speaker Breslin: "The record will reflect that. House Bill 3426,
Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich asks leave
to have this Bill heard immediately. Does he have leave?
Hearing no objection, leave is granted. House Bill 3426,
Clerk read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3426, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3426 is a House Bill in response to a possible plan to incinerate potentially toxic and dangerous chemicals in a heavily populated community. This Bill will designate any facility that plans to transfer, store, incinerator, or treat, more than one tone of chemical waste from the manufacturer and designate it as a regional pollution control facility. In the past if a company is disposing waste from chemical manufactured on its premises it wasn't required to receive local governmental approval. This Bill will keep any company from accepting waste from...well not out of state, accepting waste. The Bill is applicable to all counties with a census population of 200 persons or more per square of mile. Any facility meeting this

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

criteria will be required to get local government approval. I and the Bill's Sponsors believe that the people who live in this affected area should have the right to decide if chemicals will pollute their air and I urge your 'aye' vote on House Bill 3426."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3426, on the question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. What does this have to do with local siting? Does it enhance the power of local siting, or does it restrict its use?"

Dunn: "Huh? I'm sorry, Representative. I didn't hear your question."

McCracken: "Does this give more local communities the veto power in this siting that is currently the law?"

Dunn: "Yes it should. Yes."

McCracken: "Alright. So it doesn't affect the authority to site.

It's merely extends that to other municipalities, is that it?"

Dunn: "That's correct. They should have the right to approve the, of the incinerator. Within a five mile radius."

McCracken: "Alright. Now what waste is subject to the Bill? Is all types of waste fill or landfill sightings?"

Dunn: "All hazardous waste..."

McCracken: "Hazardous waste only?"

Dunn: "Which includes for the transfer storage treatment of disposal of incineration of hazardous waste, hazardous hospital waste, hazardous substance special waste, pollution control waste, municipal waste, slodge or any combination thereof."

Speaker Breslin: . "Any further discussion?"

McCracken: "No, that's it."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman from Will, Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Van Duyne."

Terzich: "Don't make it to difficult."

Van Duyne: "What effect would this have on the present siting regulations that we have right now? As far as I understand the Bill, the law, the county in which this facility is going to be located has first veto. Are you listening?"

Terzich: "I'm listening. I'm just trying to get the..."

Van Duyne: "What effect does this have on the county authority for siting? Does this take it away from the county and give it to the municipalities?"

Terzich: "I don't believe it has any impact on that at all.

Basically, what it does, is it lets the local community or local municipality make a decision as to whether or not that they want to authorize the building of such incinerators."

Van Duyne: "I'm sorry. I didn't understand a word the Gentleman said."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman indicated that municipalities have the right to site if the facility is totally within its own boundaries."

Van Duyne: "Well then, in direct answer to my question, it does usurp the authority of the county."

Speaker Breslin: "No, it does not."

Van Duyne: "No, it does not?"

Speaker Breslin: "It just expands the authority to other municipalities surrounding that municipality."

Van Duyne: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas."

Van Duyne: "Okay. Simply put, it brings more people into the act rather than take it away from the county?"

Speaker Breslin: "Correct. Representative Kulas, the chairman of

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

the committee, Representative Kulas."

- Rulas: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I rise opposed to House Bill 3426. It's another attempt to appease a certain local community, it doesn't look at the whole problem. This is a band—aid approach to a major problem that we are facing in this state and that is a solid waste disposal problem. How are we gonna get rid of our garbage ect., where is going to go and ect. What we're doing here is, won't help anybody, we've had a committee that has been working on this issue for over a year. Somethings going to be done on this matter this year and I would ask for a 'no' vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "In the interest of time, Ladies and Gentleman,
 I'd like to recognize Representative Terzich to close, and
 then recognize all others to explain their votes, if that's
 okay. Representative Terzich to close."
- Terzich: "Yes, you know, Representative Kulas, this is hazardous waste. This has nothing to do with solid waste. This is hazardous waste material and certainly all it does is expand to the local communities. This is not that a community will accept this type of a facility, and that's right of everybody. Especially those people who live in a community certainly should have a say so, and I would move your support for House Bill 3426."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3426 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Voting is open. The Gentleman from Vermilion,

 Representative Black. One minute to explain your vote."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's unfortunate that we couldn't debate this, I not sure that the Gentleman has adequately explained the Bill. I think it would effectively prohibit a...a plant, an industrial manufacturing facility, maybe even a newspaper from storing

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

its waste on site, until it can dispose of it. And if that's the case, he may be creating more problems then what he's trying to solve. But we're not going to get to that issue now, and perhaps a 'present' vote will be advisable, because it looks to me that there are some...it looks to me that we have some real problems with this Bill as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I had several concerns on the Bill

McNamara: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I had several concerns on the Bill which I need to have clarified. One is, and maybe the Sponsor could nod his head, this is Representative Terzich if you could nod your head, this...this Amendment #1 was deleted, and #2 is on which is effectively is the same I understand. Is that correct?"

Speaker Breslin: "He's nodding his head yes."

McNamara: "And the other thing that I'm concerned about is, in Amendment #2, this Amendment #2 limits that facility only to hazardous waste type of facilities. Okay. And the only other concern is, is the 'Epersay' Paper Company which reclaims newspapers and is the only site that large in the State of Illinois, does take the inks and everything else out of the newspapers. Does this effect their operation?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, one minute to explain your vote."

Terzich: "I don't want to explain my vote. I gave him an answer."

Speaker Breslin: "In answer to those questions? Okay, Lady from

Cook, Representative Zickus. One minute to explain your

vote."

Zickus: "Thank you. I just wanted to say, I think this is a very good Bill. It's very similar to one that I had introduced, House Bill 3086. It affords the residents of densely populated areas the opportunity to either accept or reject a proposal such as an incinerator being constructed in

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- their area."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson.

 One minute to explain your vote."
- Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I join with Representative Kulas, when he expressed a question as to what exactly we're doing here. As I recall, Representative McPike's Bill 4013 is out there right now to take a comprehensive look at this very package. And I don't think we should mesh Senate Bill 176 from 1981 in a piecemeal fashion but rather address the whole issue where everyone has the opportunity to express an opinion and come down with a reasonable decision. I would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill, because it will give more local control to communities who would be directly...whose health would be directly affected by incineration. I don't think incineration has the technology...is safe. Especially when we look and understand the fact that PCBs from as far away as Mexico are found..."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "From as far away as Mexico are finding their way into

 Lake Michigan. I don't want an incinerator in by back

 yard, and I certainly don't want an incinerator in

 anybody's back yard, because air emissions don't know any

 bounds. They don't know back yards."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."
- Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Terzich, I just wonder if you can answer a question for me? I've got a Sinclair County down there, they work long and hard, lots of years, they've already got an incinerator in operation

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

now, and their spending millions of dollars on it. It's working fine, they have no problem. Would this allow somebody like East St. Louis or Belleville, which is joined into this incinerator, would this allow them to come in and say no you've got to shut this whole operation down now?" Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."

- Terzich: "Not to my knowledge. I...I wouldn't think so. This would be basically of, you know, new incinerators, and when they file for application that that's when it would apply."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Goforth, he says this only applies to new...pro...projects. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the Assembly, I rise in support of this legislation, as Representative Zickus said, we're speaking of densely populated areas, and the people, the voters, they should have the opportunity for their own health to decide what exactly should be going on within that given community. This is why we want great support for this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all vo...the Gentleman Bureau, Representative Mautino. One minute to explain your vote."
- Mautino: "Real quickly. The reason I'm voting 'present' for those of you who are downstaters, did you listen to the last Speaker? The legislation addresses densely populated areas. Guess what the alternative is when you pass this Bill? You establish the incinerators in the less populated areas. Understand?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 22 voting 'present'.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3623, Representative...excuse me. Representative Shaw is recognized for a special introduction."

Shaw: "Thank you. At this time we have the new president of Chicago State University, Dr. Doloras Cross here with us this evening. She was just appointed the new President of Chicago State University. And welcome to Illinois, Doctor. Certainly the doctor would like to say a couple of words or two."

Dr. Cross: "It's a real pleasure to have been appointed President of Chicago State University. I believe in Chicago State University. I also feel we can do much to facilitate the success and graduation of its students. I will need your support. I'll need your advise, your input. I'll work with you through the Chancellor, and the Illinois State Board...Illinois State Governing Boards for state colleges and universities, and I know we can succeed. This success is not about me, it's about the students. I'm student centered. I care about students. Many of those students are here. I think I can make a difference, but I'll need your support. Thank you very, very much."

Shaw: "Thank you, Doctor."

Breslin: "The next Bill is House Bill 3623, Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. House Bill 3962, Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3962, a Bill for an Act to amend the Riverboat Gambling Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, House Bill 3962 is a shell Bill that I don't...didn't think we're going to use. We were not going to proceed with the Bill, but in as much as received a message from the Gaming Board. They want us to address the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

issue of the \$500 limit, or the...the adjustment of the 20 percent of the gross tax. We're gonna need a Bill to address those two issues. The deadline, they sent us this notice after the deadline, so we haven't had time to have a hearing, I'd like to send it over to the Senate so they can have a hearing, and then we'll have a Conference Committee Report. And address the two issues presented by the Gaming Board. And I urge the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 3962, and on that question, is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 36..3962 pass?' All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take...have all voted who wish? 60 votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present'. Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

- Black: "Well it's a close vote, Madam Speaker. I hope everybody's voted their own switch. We request verification should it receive enough votes to pass."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Tenhouse, for what reason do you
 seek recognition?"
- Tenhouse: "Record as 'aye', please."
- Speaker Breslin: "Record Representative Tenhouse as 'aye'. There are 62 voting 'aye', a verification has been requested.

 Poll those not voting, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting. Edley. And Stange.

 No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston, asks leave to be verified. Mr. Black. Mr. Black, is...is Preston have

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

leave to be verified? Mr. Preston, leave is granted. Representative Edley votes 'aye'. Representative Morrow, leave to be verified. Leave is Representative Turner, asks leave to be verified. Leave is Representative Santiago, asks leave to verified. Leave is granted. Mrs. Jones, asks leave to be verified. And leave is granted. Representative Black."

Black: "Madam Speaker, it appears that your people are streaming back to the chamber, I don't wish to be dilatory, there's no reason to go though this. Withdraw my request."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, withdraw...the Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. On this question, there are 63 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3984, Representative Ewing. Mr. Ewing. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3984, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a little clean up Bill on some lottery legislation we passed last year dealing with the presentation of tickets. And it's designed to provide as we do in a Court of Law, how a person could adequately prove that they had a ticket if it was lost. This is because of a constituent problem in my district where there was a lost ticket, and the department didn't feel that they could pay the claim even though they recognize it wasn't a fraudulent claim. I think this is good legislation to allow people to have the opportunity to prove that they had a lottery ticket, like we would in a Court of Law. And yet not open the system up to abuse. And I would ask for your favorable consideration of the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3984, on that question is there any discussion? There being none...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Levin: "I may...I missed part of your presentation, did you indicate the position that the lottery has with respect to this legislation?"

Ewing: "No, I did not."

Levin: "Can you tell us what the department..."

Ewing: "The lottery people haven't talked to me about the legislation. The lottery people have not talked to me about the legislation."

Levin: "Okay, because I recall when the ligation was going on they felt very strongly that this could lead to fraud and abuse. You don't know if they changed their position or..."

Ewing: "No, I certainly don't know that they have changed their position."

Levin: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3984, pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'.
Voting is open. Representative McGann do you wish to explain your vote? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109, 110 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4009, Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4009, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Amendment #2 strikes everything from the en...enacting clause...what...two what is it three?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to
 the Order of Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Does
 he have leave? Hearing no objection. Leave is granted.
 Are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Capparelli."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank...thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 removes everything from the acting clause. We have a little problem with a spill. We would like to keep it alive. I ask everybody to vote 'aye'. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 4009. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Next Order of Business is the Order of Insurance. The Order of Insurance. Insurance, Second Reading. The Sponsors are Giorgi, Mautino, Williams. First Bill, House Bill 1014. Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 7 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motion filed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10 offered by Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Matijevich. Matijevich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #10 would require that the Director of Department of Insurance shall order the companies writing policies of automobile insurance to report twice a year and once annually to the legislature, to disclose by zip code the following: the number of automobile insurance policies in effect, the average premium for liability coverage, the average premium for comprehensive coverage, the average incurred under liability coverage, the average loss incurred loss under comprehensive coverage, and the average limit of coverage provided in each policy for liability and comprehensive. This is a...a disclosure type of report and I think it would be beneficial to the consumers in the It's something that ought to be done, and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #10."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #10 to House Bill 1014. On that question, is there any discussion. There being none. The question is, 'Shall Amendment 10 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentlemen from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Excuse me, Madam. I had the light on I think just at the time you called that. I would like to address the issue."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Sir."

Regan: "The Insurance Department at this particular time al...already collects this information, and it's done by geography. And the premiums are in the book. And they do it once a year. I'd like to know the objectivity of twice a year. It doesn't seem to make sense, and I would be opposed. Plus it adds, how much cost? \$75,000 for the department to do this twice a year."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "Was that a question, Representative Regan?"
- Regan: "That was a statement. I'm sorry, I would wish you to vote 'no' on the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "A statement, fine. The Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Pedersen."
- Pedersen, B.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1014...House Bill 1014 has...has become known as the IPAC Christmas Tree Bill. The Representative sponsored this Amendment of course is very sympathetic to their views. This is really a step towards rate regulation with IPAC has already wanted. And I think that we all know how there has never been a regulation or a tax that IPAC never was happy about. So, I think we can let this one ride, too. I urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall...the question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. A simply majority is required for the adoption of the Amendment. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11 offered by Representative Terzich."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "I withdraw Amendment #11."

- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #11. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12 offered by Representative Terzich."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Amendment #12 basically stipulates that every group policy or accident health insurance that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

is issued in the state shall provide for a extension of benefits upon termination of benefits. And I would move for it's adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 12 to House Bill 1014. On that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Terzich: "Certainly."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, there have been so many Amendments on this particular issue, it's hard to keep up.

I...I think that Amendment #12 is basically the same as you had in Amendment #9. Correct?"

Terzich: "Yes. Yes."

Black: "You're mandating some health insurance coverage? Is
that..."

Terzich: "No."

Black: "What...what are you doing...what are you doing in 12 then?"

Terzich: "We're simply applying the extension of benefits to a terminated policy."

Black: "So you're mandating the extension."

Terzich: "There are some contracts that are issued that when termination of a master contract, that they're not provide for an extension of benefits for employees that are disabled on the date of termination. This simply will allow that they must have an extension of benefits upon termination."

Black: "Okay. Alright. Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 12 be adopted?' All those in

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 3323, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3323, a Bill for an Act in relation to the affordability and adequacy of health care for the citizens of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton on Amendment 2."

Cullerton: "Yes. Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam I believe that this Bill is a Bill that has some 20 or so Amendments. 22 or so Amendments. T have Amendments 2 through 20, and I just thought I would give a brief explanation as to what we're doing. The Bill purports to abolish or repeal 20 individual statutes that the General Assembly has passed over the course of a number of years. So, it's my intension to take in effect a separate vote on whether or not we wish to repeal those sections. The Bill is advanced by the...some employer group, and it's their theory that we're going to make health insurance more affordable by eliminating the so called mandating benefits. And once we do that the premiums could come down 15 to 25 percent. As a result, the business people who could save that money would then turn around and encourage their employers to go out and buy the insurance. I think before we take that course of action, we should take a look at each one of these

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

individual so called mandated benefits and decide whether or not we want to do it. Now, the first one that I've chosen is the most resent so called mandated benefit that passed. And this is...this deals with mammography tests, that we passed this last year, it was Representative Didrickson's Bill. It passed very strong support. She was as I recalled extremely articulate in passing this Bill, because she pointed out, as is obvious, you have mammography test as part of your health insurance proposal, that you're going to have preventative medicine enhanced. And as a result in the long run, you're in effect going to save money. And the idea of course, of the need for early detection of breast cancer is obvious, as a matter of fact, I think we all received a letter from one of our former colleagues, Lynn Martin, who is a Member of Congress, who is very involved with the concerns of breast cancer. In fact, she said that in a letter to us, on May 1st and May 2nd she was going to be giving a speech on the House of Representatives, trying to urge people that is a true family issue, and urged us to watch that program. To talk to our constituents about the need for early detection in mammography. So, I think personally, that we should pass this Amendment. I think we should continue to have a requirement that the health insurance proposals include mammography testing. I think it makes sense. think in the case of this particular...of all Amendments, this is probably the most obvious one that we should retain. And I would be happy to answer any questions. And I would urge us to retain the Bill that Representative Didrickson passed last year."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for adoption of
Amendment 2 to House Bill 3323, and on that question the
Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Two things I think should be brought to bear on this Amendment process. Number one, let me state to you, that the Amendment that was adopted committee, provides for a bare bones health care affordable program, that is going to be eligible for those individuals for the last twelve months in working for their employer, have not had the opportunity to have health care coverage. That means that we are providing a bare bones affordability program because of the cost of many of the mandates. Representative Cullerton addressed the question that is already law in this state as it pertains to mammography. Almost all of us in this House supported that provision which is now law in the statute. It is not the intention of this legislation, nor is it my intension, anything employee take away from any who has currently currently...who is now covered bу any employer-employee health program. This is only for those individuals who do not have any insurance. This would allow them the opportunity to participate, for example, if they worked for a fast food outlet, where there are many part time employees. The reason I give the background information, is if in fact you're going to provide affordable insurance to that segment of our society that cannot afford any now, or those employers that don't the financial wherewithal to provide them, because of what we have enacted. This gives the alternative, and those of us in the General Assembly the opportunity to say, yes, we are going to provide a program that they can afford. For that reason, I'm going to stand in opposition to all Amendments presented on this legislation. Ιf we reinstitute those mandates, we are defeating the purpose of providing affordable health care for those individuals who

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

are working, but now and for the last twelve months have had the opportunity to have that coverage. Αn individual employer may not cancel his current or her current insurance coverage and opt into this program, this only for those individuals who have not had insurance coverage for the last twelve months. Therefore, although the Representative is well intention, the Amendments on this Bill, are to reinstitute the mandates and in effect kill the legislation and make sure that those citizens of our state who are working but don't have insurance will not have the opportunity to have any at an affordable cost. Therefore, I stand in opposition to this as well as the other Amendments that have been filed on this Bill. can use that as response number one and we'll replay it and rebuild it on each of the additional Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I afraid that, Madam Speaker, I'm afraid that not enough people in this House are paying attention to what I consider to be one of the most serious problems in this state. And that is of affordable health care by maybe 10 percent or more of the population of this state. I have a similar Bill, very similar to the Sponsor's Bill. would be with employers of less than twenty-five. point is still the same. This is an effort to provide health insurance through business for people who are not now covered. There is...there are safe guards in the Bill to prevent business from dropping better coverages and taking this policy. This may or may not be the answer, Ladies and Gentlemen, but if we don't try to solve this problem, eventually government will have to take over our medical system. This is terribly important.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Amendment is put...offered only to kill this Bill. Vote 'no' on this Amendment and each of the following Amendments. This is a very reasonable approach, and I would ask for your strong opposition to the Sponsor's of the Amendments on Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't re...need to repeat what Rep...Representative Mautino and Ewing have already mentioned, but there are a couple of things I think we should emphasis. One of them is there are a lot of out there now who don't have medical insurance. This is a way to provide them at least with some basic hard core coverage so that they have something. And there's nothing in the Bill that prevents an employer of...including any of these things, if...if his group or if he feels he afford it, he can add the little ones extra ones in if he wants to. So, it's flexible, it provides coverage that isn't there now. And if we add all of these Amendments, all we're really doing is going back to what we already got. So why bother. So I think we should vote 'no' on all of these Amendments as they come though."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

This debate seems to have moved from a discussion of Amendment #2 to a philosophical discussion about health care. If that's the case so be it, let me add my two cents. I rise in opp...in support of this Amendment and of all of the others that follow. The original intent of House Bill 3323 is to provide sort of a cheaply insurance policy, if you will. The coverages that have been mandated

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

are important coverages. Failure to retain those coverages as mandates will add to the nearly \$700 million in care that hospitals in this state are now providing for one a half million dollar...one and a half million uninsured people in our state. This will allow this cost shifting...will require that those that are paying will pay a higher share of hospital costs and those are paying insurance premiums will pay a higher insurance premiums because of those higher hospital costs. would also affect those cash pay customers that go into hospitals, and the continued effort to erode health care is not going to be resolved by the initial intent of House Bill 3323. But will only be resolved by a better effort by the General Assembly to do a better job funding hospitals in their medicaid programs so that they can continue to reduce costs not only for the medicaid programs, but for those people who are paying their way in the hospitals and those insurers, employers and insurance companies who are involved in group health insurance for their employees. urge you to strongly consider the message and as it relates to Floor Amendment #2, to do away with this mammography coverage, would be criminal in my view. This is important coverage. We must retain this coverage, and we must keep it as a mandate if we're to keep our effort intact in these Please vote 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Du Page, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We should be clear on what the issue is. The underlying Bill will provide for affordable health care coverage for those who are not currently insured. There are as Representative Ewing said, there are safe guards which will prevent this from being abused by any employer, if they currently offer coverage

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

beyond the minimum set forth in this Bill, they can not reduce that coverage, but let me make another point. mandates are not as effective as many would lead you to believe. Our largest employers in this state are self insured, to the extent that they are self insured they are not subject to these mandates in the first place. IBM, John Deere, Caterpiller, all of those companies are free to give their employees any health benefits they And it doesn't take a genius to figure out that the collective bargaining process for those large companies has worked. A collective bargaining pro...process empowers employees to get benefits even though we have not mandated them. This is not an issue over whether people currently covered are going to be deprived of future benefits that is not the issue. Don't be fooled by this. Any report on how you vote on these Amendments, will take out of context what is truly the point of this Bill, to give more insurance coverage that is currently provided to our citizens. More people will have coverage if this Bill passes without these Amendments. I rise in opposition to this Amendment, and to all the other hostile Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There is no reason that we have to consider all of these Amendments hostile. The fact of the matter is, we have an opportunity to hear...today to decide just how bare bones such coverage should be, and we put these mandates on individually over the years because as the years went on we decided they were important. Today we have a...were really reviewing what we've done over the last few years and we can well decide as a Body that some of the mandates still make sense, are still crucial enough

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

to be on a bare bones health insurance coverage. But that other mandates we passed indeed don't need to be on that kind of coverage. I think we ought to consider these Amendments, each one at a time, and not consider them...consider them either uniformly hostile or all good Amendments."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I.. I fully concur with Representative Kirkland's point. I disagree that this is meant to kill the Bill. There is an Amendment down the line that would in effect replace the Bill, and...and we'll get to that at the proper time. What we're asking you do is to pick and chose among the mandated benefits. Some of these you can see are...are...there's a stronger argument for them than others. Now, this one in my opinion the most important. This is preventative mammography screening for women of certain ages, I believe it's over 35 years old. That's what we're trying to do. We're saying that in this particular piece of legislation, if you want to eliminate all the mandated benefits except for one, this is the one you should keep, because this so called mandated benefit actually saves money in the long run. Many not for one individual insurance company, but VOII early...if you can detect cancer early, you're going to save hospital costs in the future. Now, I want to remind you, that last year we passed this Bill, Representative Didrickson might refresh my memory, I think there was close to 80 votes, and I just don't think we should turn around the next year and repeal it, especially when it makes so much sense. So I would urge you on this particular Bill. Hospital Association and the Labor join with the Organizations who have indicated their support for the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Amendment. And please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Mautino, one minute to explain your vote."

Mautino: "Please let me assure if...you...if anyone has not looked at the Bill, this is a new Act. It creates another section by which this type of insurance can be provided. It does not eliminate mandates that are already established in the statute or contractually negotiated. If you put this Amendment on, which is the Heart String Amendment, you might as well put them all on, and then we have no affordable program for those people we are trying provide it to. If you put it on, it kills the Bill. you put the Amendments on, I will pull the Bill out of the I have no other choice. But think about what you're doing. You're going to leave this General Assembly without addressing that issue of providing affordable health care with..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, conclude your remarks, Sir."

Mautino: "I think you know my feelings."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich. One minute to explain your vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker. One of the biggest cost for health care has been basically what the benefits that we have mandated in the General Assembly. So what we are basically telling everybody, is what's good for them, especially in this case, a mammogram. Apparently someone must need insurance for mammography, but if that's the case, the Bill basically allows the company or the employer, who ever it is to purchase this type of insurance. If you continuously add on another mandate, as...as Representative Mautino said, it just completely guts the Bill, and it doesn't

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

serve the purpose of what it is. And that's to give the people an affordable health insurance policy, and let that up to them to decide the type of benefits they want in their contract, and not the General Assembly. So I would move...urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I voted for the mammography

last year and I still think it's a good idea on a regular

Bill. But this is for a those who have no insurance.

You're constituents who..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, proceed Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Constituents who have no insurance at all will not thank you for this. There are other ways to find out if there's a breast tumor. They can find out and have the surgery. If you vote 'no' on this, I mean if you vote 'yes' on this, they will not be able to afford the surgery. The surgery is covered under this basic plan. They have nothing now. They have nothing. Let them have the right to have some coverage by voting 'no' on this Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke, one minute to explain your vote."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I just want to point out that small business men and women in this state need us to vote 'no' on this, so we can present a policy that they can afford."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Olson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Olson, M.: "Very quickly, Madam Speaker. Representatives Mautino, Pedersen and the others who are Sponsors of this Bill have been looking at this for a number of months. Their specifically aware of the elements of the Amendments coming to the Bill, and the intent of the Bill, and therefore they deserve your support in defeating this

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Amendment."

Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 46 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', and 13 voting 'present'. Representative Cullerton, what is your pleasure? The Amendment fails.

Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, this Amendment deals with adopted children. So I guess if...if breast cancer does not win your maybe we can talk about adopted children. Now, you have to believe...to vote 'no' on these things, you have to believe some of the gobbledygook that was...that was spoken during the last debate. And it just isn't true. If these insurance companies are allowed to, they will not offer mammograhy testing and they will not offer a coverage to adopted children. Believe it or not, we had to pass a law that says that an exclusion of a child under a family coverage soley because the child is adopted was okay. So we passed a law that said, if you adopt a child that should be...that child should be considered dependent from the date of order of adoption. To eliminate this mandate, would place the state's program to place children who have physical disabilities in adoptive homes jeopardy. It would treat adoptive children like second class citizens. Can you imagine an insurance policy that...that says, oh, we only cover your birth children, not your adopted children. And that's what the Bill does, it eliminates that. And this Amendment is designed to say, adopted children sh...must be covered. Think about...think about what you're doing by voting against this. It just, and it doesn't by the way mandate that they provide health

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

insurance, it just says if they provide health insurance to a family and you happen to have adopted children, the adopted children have to be covered. Now, come on, think about it. I move for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 3. On the question, the Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Goforth: "Representative, did I hear you just a few minutes ago, say we had 20 Amendments on this Bill?"

Cullerton: "Well, we're eliminating 20 laws in one swoop, so I thought we'd have 20 Amendments."

Goforth: "Have we...have we got 20?"

Cullerton: "At least 20."

Goforth: "Okay, now does this 20th Amendment says that we repeal all the rest of these Amendments we're hearing right now?"

Cullerton: "The 20th Amendment is entirely different Bill that
the Hospital Association wants passed, dealing with
mandating certain business to provide insurance coverage to
those who don't provide it."

Goforth: "But, if that Amendment passes, we repeal all these Amendments we may or may not pass now."

Cullerton: "If...if these Amendments pass, I may not call that Amendment."

Goforth: "Okay, I was just wondering why we was hanging everybody out on all these Amendments, then turn right around on the 20th Amendment and repeal every damn thing we've already done. Thank you."

Cullerton: "No, no. You're not going...you're not going to vote for that Amendment, you don't have to worry about it. I might not even call it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Leverenz on the Amendment."

- Leverenz: "Yes, I just had a small inquiry to share. I never hear Representative Goforth speak twice in the same day before, and I wonder who allowed him to read the Amendments before they were even called."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much. Included in the remarks made by Representative Cullerton, was a fact that there is no definition of adopted child. There is a...there is coverage of dependents. It is not in...con...precluded from the Act, and there is definition of a dependent, it's on page one section 3(b). The point once again, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the same that people could be offered a policy do not have that opportunity now to have that policy offered for...to them. And we in fact not trying to take anything away from anybody, but provide a new portion of the statute that this type of policy could be sold. As I said in my earlier remarks, I think the Amendments are filed so that the Bill..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me...excuse me, Rep..excuse me, Representative Mautino, there's a point of order. Representative Cullerton state your point."
- Cullerton: "We might be able to save some time here.

 Representative Mautino's telling me that adoptive children

 are included in the definition of dependents, then I'll

 withdraw the Amendment. But it sure doesn't look like that

 when I read it."
- Mautino: "What I said Representative Cullerton, was the coverage of dependents is not precluded by the Act, and in fact there is a definition of dependent on page one, section 3(b)."
- Cullerton: "So, that if...if the policy wanted to exclude adopted

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- children, it could. Since it's not specifically indicated in the definition as a dependent."
- Mautino: "That's why it's difficult to discuss terms with attorneys. I just said, I do not mispeak, when I said coverage of dependents is not precluded from the Act, in fact, there is definition of dependent, page one, section 3(b)."
- Cullerton: "Okay, thank you. I think we need the Amendment.

 Thank you, Madam Speaker, I didn't mean to interrupt."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of Amendment. It. seems only fair, because you hear two or three policies are involved here. Ιf as Representative Mautino said, that the adoptive children are covered under the definition of dependent, then adding dependent on adoptive child won't necessarily change the law. It will only help to make it clear as to what the intent is and ought to be careful to make sure we do the right thing. The other policy I'd like to speak about is one that we have to encourage that people will adopt children. know in some black neighborhoods we have an overabundance of young children that have not been able to find adoptive parents. If in fact you tell them that if they adopt a child that that child won't be able to get proper health coverage under a health plan policy that will be presented to the rest of the family, you in essence discourage them from adopting children. This is a very basic sort of Amendment. This is a very basic sort of Anyone with good common decency would basically allow for persons with a adopted child to have that child covered under whatever insurance benefits that they would be able to have for the rest of their children.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

just be a shame to have three children of your own are all covered and one adopted child who's not. This is just a very basic Amendment. The Sponsor has already said that he felt that it's very...of the Sponsor of the Bill, very possible that this particular coverage may already be involved, and if it isn't we need to be perfectly clear that it is included. And I urge an 'aye' vote on Amendment #3."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been in the business my whole adult life. I've never heard of an insurance policy that excluded an adoptive child. An adoptive child is an dependent, member of the family legally. I mean by definition that's what adoption is all about. So...so all we're...all saying is if anybody offered a policy like that and they had an exclusion in there for adopted children. you know that's what you buy, they give you a copy of the contract that has a list of exclusions, and you get down there and it says, we're...we're going to exclude your adoptive child, they'd laugh them out of the office. mean nobody does this so, I just think we're just spinning our wheels on this and let's keep it clean, keep it keep it flexible. So that the people who don't have insurance now can get coverage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't believe some of the things I'm hearing. Are we going to negotiate away the lives of adopted children? Are we going to negotiate away the health of adoptive children? We talked about policy simplification recently, are we gonna make people read the fine language in the contract to determine which of their

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

children are covered by insurance. And which of their children are not covered by insurance. It's absurd on the face of it. It makes no sense. If I have an adopted child, and I'm driving in my car, and we have an accident, and I'm killed, my adoptive child will take my money as my heir. But that same child, that that child is injured will have to go on welfare to pay their medical expenses. Makes no sense at all, vote 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Oh, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I...I don't believe what I'm hearing either. My wife and I are adoptive parents, so I think I feel qualified to speak on You know, I don't know why we have to demagaque every issue that comes down here and waste everybody's time. This isn't a pro-business Bill, it isn't a pro-label whatever you want to put on a Bill. How in the world can you get up an demagaque about who's covered, what's covered, what isn't covered. We're talking about thousands of people who aren't covered at all. They don't have any insurance. For God's sake. The Gentleman has explained his Bill. You're going to add thousands of people to insurance coverage who don't have any. He's explained what he's trying to do. Don't demagogue the issue for God's sake. It isn't a businsses Bill. It's a people Bill. Vote everyone of these Amendments down and move affordable health care coverage to where it belongs, on the Governor's desk."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, my distinguished colleague from Vermilion County
made an impassioned speech and he is right, it should

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

be...it does belong on the governor's desk. But it certainly seems to me, that when you offer health care to a family how you can exclude an adoptive child is beyond me. Under any circumstance. I mean the insurance companies shouldn't even be able offer a rider that excludes an adopted child. Now maybe that's going to far. adoptive child should be included, and for all of us on this House floor who have stood up and said that their pro-family, that their pro-children, that encourage adoption, that we don't want to leave kids on the street, that we don't want leave kids who might be born to families where they're not going to be taken care of, that we want to encourage birth and not something else, those people who are pro-family, we want the kids adopted. And one way to encourage that is to ensure if they are adopted, their going to have health insurance benefits. It's fair. seems reasonable. And to me only logical. I think a 'yes' vote is the appropriate vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Du Page, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Well, now I don't now what to do, I'm torn. I guess my question is, why can't we let people bargain for this. You know, people have brains, they have options. If you're going to take away the possibility of any exclusion, it's going to cost money which the consumer will have to pay. You know, we are so paternalistic here, we act as if the average citizen can't protect himself, or he can't bargain. Now, I don't know if that there is a situation where a responsible person would want to exclude an adopted child, but why do we have to get in the business of telling people what bargains they should make. You act as if we don't adopt this Amendment it will result in thousands of adoptive children going without insurance. Don't you think

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

the parents are going to buy the insurance. It's not going to cost any more or less whether we mandate it. But why make it part of the cost if in some situations there reason not to include an adoptive child. I mean, I can't think of it, but there are so many permutations out Why not let the parties contract. The whole point of this is to get coverage to the point of affordability where people who are not insured now, can get insurance. Why not leave it flexible. You think some responsible father or mother is going to go around and buy health care that excludes an adopted child. You know, I just don't see how the issues follow. I think when Representative Black referred to demagoguery, he was correct. This is not an issue of encouraging or discouraging adoption, that absolute nonsense. It's the freedom to contract. people for some valid reason want to contract that way, why should they not be able to. I...I just don't agree it's a question of adoption verses nonadoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells." Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of Amendment. Ιt appears that the Sponsor thinks adoptive children are covered anyway, but if the Sponsor of the Amendment feels that they're not covered, it certainly won't hurt to put this in. We all know that adoptive children should be covered. This is not a matter kind of coverage were talking about, that's what the other arguments about. How much are you going to cover? This the who. And if you are totally responsible for that person as Representative Lang pointed out, then of course that person should be covered. It probably already is covered, but in case there is some debate about it, this Amendment on and make sure that all adoptive children are covered."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Madam Speaker, I move to previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put, representative Cullerton to close. Do you wish to close, Sir."

Cullerton: "The...well, I think I better. There's something I should point out, as I re...as I read this Bill. would encourage the...those on the other side as we debate this, to look at it themselves. As I read this Bill. could affect employers who now provide health insurance. who drop health insurance and wait one year, then you're allowed to offer these policies without these benefits. So Representative Black's case, if he has a theoretically, that covers his adopted children, policy could be dropped, a year later when it's offered. then the adoptive children will not be covered. Now. don't think the people are demagoguery, I just think it's ridiculous to think that if it's so obvious that adoptive children should be covered. And since the definition in the Bill does not include adopted children in the...in definition. We should just put it in. Now as far as this Bill only applying to those who don't have coverage, that's simply not the case. And what we're saying is a matter of public policy is, if they are going to offer insurance to people who don't have insurance right now, there are certain minimum things that should be included like having you're adopted children be covered. So, please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Parke, one minute to explain your vote."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Previously Representative Parcells made a plea that perhaps this should go on. I might approach it in different matter. I would like this to not go on. Because I believe this Amendment is out of order, that in fact, when you adopt someone they become a dependent and they are covered under your health insurance. But if there...since there is confusion, I would like this not to go on, and if in fact it's interpreted by the law staffs, that in fact there is a problem with this, in the Senate, let the Senate amend it, bring it back and then we will change it at that time. But I think this Bill should stay clean. If we want affordable health insurance for the small business men and women, and for those in this society who don't have insurance at all, I think we should leave it clean for time being and wait until we reevaluate it when it's in the So, I would ask that we vote 'no' on this Senate. Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino, you already spoke in debate. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Mautino: "I was going to pose a question since it looks like that

 Amendment is going to be adopted, but...alright."
- Speaker Breslin: "You can't...you can't speak to this issue at this point. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 58 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', and 7 voting 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Cullerton: "And now for а little change of pace. Alcoholism. born children is next. Now we're talking about Policies which provide inpatient coverage for alcoholism. sicknesses are prohibited from excluding such coverage for treatment of alcoholism under this mandate. This states that the policy covers inpatient services. it must cover inpatient alcoholism services. Since the current practice is to deny inpatients stays after three days, elimination this mandate would not save insurers significate dollars, it would just place certain individuals at serious financial risk. I urge an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Amendment 4. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "Is this the Amendment that imposes the \$100 a month tax per employee?"

Cullerton: "No."

Leverenz: "Which one is that? Which one of these Amendments, this is Amendment #4."

Cullerton: "I think it's about #20. If it's offered."

Leverenz: "20. I should wait for Amendment #20."

Cullerton: "If it's offered. But this is on alcoholism."

Leverenz: "Well, the one I'm interested in imposes the hundred a month tax per employee."

Cullerton: "So, just vote 'aye' from here on out until we get to 20 and then I'll talk to you."

Leverenz: "I see, well, now Representative Goforth, I want you to share this information on Amendment #20 that imposes the \$100 a month tax per employee."

Cullerton: "We'll get to that, we're on #4 this is alcoholism."

Leverenz: "Why don't you just withdraw it and go for the big

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

one?"

Cullerton: "I might withdraw 20 if we get some of these on."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've been here a long there's 22 Amendments filed on this Bill. This one address alcoholism, and that's going to be followed by newborn children, and conversion of former spouses, and disability, and dependent coverage, and sexual assault coverage, and organ transplants, blood and blood components, death and divorce continuation, reduction of benefits for MPA's and pediatrists, whatevers. reimbursement for a..prost...prost...prosthetics and reconstructive surgery, don't know, T&A, I don't know, then DES coverage, then public aid, and continuation. Representative Cullerton, why don't we save the time of the Members of this House, this legislation started off as good prop...as a good You've got another two hours of Amendments, because there's 22 filed. Why don't we quit fooling the public. Let's decide what you want to do. You got your Amendment on, he was very happy in place in mammography, he got adopted children. You want to spend two and a half hours doing this again, and continuation. John, make your issue known. You've adopted it. You want to qet Amendment #20, why don't you withdraw all the playing games that your doing, let's get to you Amendment, put your hospital programs on the table and let the poor souls out here that don't know what's going on, give them some light at the end of the tunnel, will you please."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich. Mr. Matijevich is recognized."

Matijevich: "Mr...Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

House, I've supported the liquor industry, I've supported tavern owners, but let me tell you, I also had the Bill that created the Division of Alcoholism. It is 1990, we're not 1890, it's 1990. It's about time we realized that alcoholism is a disease."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen, demonstrations are not allowed from the gallery. Demonstration are not allowed from the gallery. Proceed, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Are we going to turn the clock back to those days when doctors would phony up...would phony up the report and say that the patient suffered from something other than alcoholism, so that that person would be covered insurance. No. We should not turn back to that day. should be forthful, and forefront, and say that a person does suffer from that disease. There's nothing wrong with that. They ought re...be recovered from that. An insurance policy do as they do now, cover for the disease of alcoholism. We ought to make that explicite. And that's what this Amendment does. Now, everybody knows that I've...I've supported the industry, but I think we ought to care of those people who suffer from the over...the abuse of alcohol. So, I urge the support of Amendment #4."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson.

Mr. Olson. Mr. Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We allude back to what Representative Mautino just told us. We are not discussing i.e., the merits in his discussion of the various Amendments comming in which all have laudatory goals. The fact of the matter is, the intention of this Bill is to bring to a greater number of people in the State of Illinois affordable health care and to enable their employers to offer it. We don't worry

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

about the major employers in the state, such as General Motors, IBM and those others. They have these types of plans. The essence of what the Representative's offering is to offer a program that more people can participate and take value from. So his remarks should be regarded with a great amount of insistance."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Move the previous question, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put.

Representative Cullerton to close. Briefly."

Cullerton: "Well, I apologize for taking up the time of the House in taking each individual Amendment. But it's Gentleman's Bill that eliminates about 20 statutes that we took a lot of time to debate in passing in which the governor signed. So, if he takes his Bill out of the I'll take my Amendments out of the record. one of them failed, the second one passed. That's what the intent of these Amendments are. And Representative Matijevich said it all. This is going to say, as a matter of public policy when you're sitting down negotiating your health insurance benefits in the fair market that we have in this society, when you're sitting down negotiating as to what's going to be included in your health insurance policy that their not going to be able trick you by not alcoholism covered under the health insurance policy. That's all this Amendment says. And as I indicated if this mandate costs a lot of money, I would be very surprised. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 4 be

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Parcells, one minute to explain your vote."

- Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I oppose this Amendment for same the reason I did the first one. This is the what is covered, not the who. We are not eliminating family members here. We're saying that some people will have no coverage. This is a new kind of a policy. We're not eliminating any mandates we've had in the past. This is a brand new policy to give a lot of people who have no coverage at all coverage. I suggest a 'no' vote on this, because it is the what is the coverage, not the who."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lang, one minute to explain your vote."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we accept that alcoholism is a disease, we have to treat it as a disease. We have drug-free work places now. W۵ have alcohol-free back seats. All of this drug-free and alcohol-free business. Are we going continue to allow alcoholism not to be treated as a Ιf you care about the people that you want to help, then we have to help them by allowing them to have And saying to them that you have to read this insurance. between the lines. And saying to them that you have to negotiate these policies, just doesn't cut it. We have to take care of sick people, all sick people, that includes people with alcohol problems. Please change your votes on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pedersen, one minute to explain
 your vote."
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know there, we always have to come back to giving people a choice. There are small groups out there

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

that don't have insurance right now. What if that group was made up of tea totalers, people who don't drink at all. They don't want to pay for the coverage. What if you have religious values that say we don't drink and we don't want pay for coverage that includes alcoholism because we don't you're need it. Ι mean what doina mandating...what you're doing is mandating something to apply to everybody when...when we really need some choice. Thanks."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw, one minute to explain your vote."

Shaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly, I think this is a good Amendment. think that more green votes should be put up there on that board. Alcohol...alcoholic...alcohol is a sickness, and it should be treated as such. But it seems as though insurance companies has gotten to a lot of people on this floor. But you should not, the people that are suffering out there, need our help. Those people vote for you. And here today, you are turning your back on the very people who sent you down here. You are not representing the people you that you should be representing by those red votes up there. You are representing the industry. insurance company. Do you want to represent the insurance company or the people that sent you here. You should vote green up there."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 36 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Cullerton."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Apparently before we passed this law, what was happening were that during these bargaining sessions with health insurance providers, they were prepared to deny health insurance to families who have children who are born prematurely or with birth abnormalities. So we passed a Bill that said if you had family coverage and then no insurer can write a policy which contains any disclaimer or limitation regarding a newborn's coverage from an after the moment of birth. And if a policy offers single coverage. as opposed to family coverage, then the newborn is covered only if the policy holder applies and pays for family coverage. Now, if we eliminate this mandate, here's what's going to happen. Personal bankruptcies will increase to catastrophic costs, the medicaid program is gonna experience an increased enrollment and increased costs, and the health care delivery system will be jeopardized due to the amount of uninsured care provided. The children will receive immediate necessary hospital care. Their long term health out comes will be worsened due to the lack of access. There's a reason why we passed these Bills in the first place. I'm just asking you to reexamine them. when ever you try to pass a controversial Bill around here. everybody talks about how, both sides of the aisle are going to do a mailing in my district, because I'm a target. Well, if that works, then I'm an...try to employ it right This says that they can not offer a policy that doesn't cover children born prematurely or with birth abnormalities. I move for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 5 be adopted?' Representative Mautino on the question?"

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Cullerton, I'll bet you're good in the court room. Ladies and Gentlemen, to my friends on both sides of the aisle, you've been strung out on mammography and adopted children, alcoholism, there is no way I'm going to string anybody out on newborn children. Please everybody vote green for this Amendment. Please put it on. I don't want to hear anybody blast anybody else that they would not vote to put into a program a newborn child. Please vote 'yes'. I rescind my previous comment about opposing all Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen, on the question."
- Pedersen: "And I naturally agree with the...Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'...the 'ayes' have it. Representative Mautino, do you insist on a Roll Call? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Well, I appreciate the support of the Sponsor and I hope that then when we get to Amendment #22 which wipes out any Amendments that may have been adopted that he keeps that in mind, and withdraws it. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110...111 voting 'aye', and 2 voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment deals with former spouses. Prohibits termination of coverage

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

based on divorce until the divorce becomes final. At that time the spouse has 60 days to request a conversion policy from the insurer, which they would...the former spouse would have to pay themselves. Their entitled to receive upon appropriate payment an individual policy similar to the prior coverage that waives any preexisting waiting period provisions. It only applies to individual policies only. I would think that it's important to have a policy...a public policy that say former spouses shall have this benefit. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman's moved adoption of Amendment 6.

 On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
- Leverenz: "Madam Speaker, on the Amendment, I'd encourage everyone to simply to vote their conscience."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, the mandate provision for coverage of former spouses is at the federal government. It is enacted. We must adhere to it at the State of Illinois. It is called COBRA. It is already there. Rather then throw another Amendment on the Bill, I say vote 'no'. It's already there under COBRA. The attorney didn't tell you that, I'm sorry. I apologize that my loyal opposition didn't tell you we're already covered by it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."
Kubik: "Move the previous question, Madam."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Cullerton to close."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Cullerton: "Yes, the COBRA provisions apply but they're not exactly mirrored. So if you want...want to insure that former spouses have this benefit, vote 'aye'. If you don't care that much, you'd vote 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment be adopted?'

 All those in favor say...those in favor vote 'aye', all
 those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.
 Representative Bowman, one minute to explain your vote."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was the author of that legislation Representative Cullerton is referring to. And in fact although COBRA is on the books on the federal level, in Illinois, we have a better system. Our policies are more progressive than the federal policies in this regard. For example, if you're 55 years or older and have never...you've never been employed before, you've been a homemaker all those years, and your husband walks out on you, under Illinois law at the present time, you can remain in the group plan by paying of course the employers cost as well as the employees cost until you get in medicare and social security. But at the...if we rely soley on COBRA, that will be taken away. So what you do..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."
- Bowman: "So what you do by rejecting this Amendment, is...is impose an undue burden on the oldest category of people who are likely to benefit for this. The people who are the most dependent, and least able to help themselves."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 27 voting 'aye', 67 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments? Representative Cullerton on Amendment #7."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #7 retains a Bill that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

we passed last year that went into effect January 1st of 1990. It was instigated due to a large number of insurers who were abandoning small business when one employee experience a disabling illness. This section also requires a new insurer to pick up the employee or the old insurer to carry the employee until the new insurers waiting period ends. The Bill is a little vague, but the...it ought to be passed but it does provide for rule promulgations by the Director of Insurance. And as I said this goes into effect...went into effect a few months ago, and I don't think we should abandon it, after only a few months. And I think this was sponsored by Representative Bowman and Mautino last year. So I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 7 be adopted?

All those in favor...is there any discussion on the question? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 7 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Amendment #8, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, Ma'am, I want to make sure I'm on the right Yes, I believe this Amendment require that benefits be continued for spouse and dependents after death divorce. It's similar to the one that we talked on diverse...divorce, it also covers death. Ιt contains various provision regarding premium notification of election. conversion to individual coverage, termination of coverage. This is a federal mandate under COBRA, and if it's eliminated at the state level, employers would still need to provide it but they may have a difficult time obtaining policies that contain the provision as specified by the federal law. So I think this is a good protection to have this in the law,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

there's no uncertainty that's it's covered by federal law."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 8. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I will suggest that all Amendments go on now. We vote 'yes' on all of them. Put them all on on a voice vote, and let's quit wasting the time of this Body, and move on to Amendment 21 and 22."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 8 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendments adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, Madam Speaker, apparently people don't want to debate these things individually, but I'm going to insist upon it. Now, this one, because we passed these Bills individually. We decided as a matter of public policy, we want to say that there should be coverage for examination of criminally...criminal sexual assult or abuse victims. We said an insurance policy can not exclude this type of exam. Someone is raped they go to the hospital, the insurance policy has to cover it. If you pass this Bill, then they could pas...they could offer a policy doesn't cover that. And it's absurd to think that someone's going to think about that when they negotiate their health insurance coverage. So as a matter of public policy, we passed this law. It can't cost that much, but...to the employers, but it's obviously something which is incredible important to person who is a victim of sexual assult, to make sure their insurance covers their hospital

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- exam. So I think we should reflect upon this. It's fine if you want to adopt these with a voice vote, but just keep in mind at the end of this there is an opportunity to vote on another Amendment that votes them all 'em all out. And we should be aware of it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption Amendment 9. On the question, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know I have a lot consider my colleagues in the House, and there...the time they have to spend and the Bills we to call. Let me make...let me make a couple of comments, Representative Cullerton has 20 Amendments. Amendments 9 to 20 on one Roll Call, John. Or include...or better take them all that have been filed. I think there's been 22 of them been filed. I move we adopt Amendments 9, if he would amend his Motion to adopt 9 through 22, that will save the time of my colleagues in the House, and they...we can all get on to other business."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, did you have to
 respond to that or can we go on to the other people
 speaking?"
- Cullerton: "Well, I...I object...I object to the suggestion,

 Amendment #22 wipes out all the previous Amendments.

 So...and goes back to the original Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "You already responded to that. Sure. Sure.

 The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "I was going to make that same point. You know, it's so gracious to allow us to do all of this one Roll Call, and then later on, wipe them all out. You know, before this Bill was even coming up, I write a weekly column, and I just started it and then this Bill came up. Let me read you the paragraph where I had a start...stop. I said the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

insurance industry is a powerful and influential lobby in the legislative process. Every time that I or others have tried to pass Bills or Amendments that could consumers, we have been thwarted. And then I go on to another Bill that's coming up later, that key auto policy what I'm going to dicuss in my weekly column. And...but I think at least we ought to hear Amendments even though it's the last day. And then later on we're going to vote for Amendment 22, and we're going to wipe out all those Amendments, because then I'm going write further on in this column have the insurance company industry has such a powerful influence over this General Assembly. I think our first obligation ought to be to the people, not to the insurance industry. Simple as that. We're wiping out of the law, protections and benefits that we for years have written into the law. It's no wonder they're calling this affordable insurance. They're going to make a fortune. They're not giving away anything. when it comes to that key auto policy, that is going to be a bonanza. That's the one Bill you guys want. You it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from McHenry,
Representative Klemm. Oh, excuse me, the Gentleman from
Repres...excuse me, Representative Klemm, Representative
Cullerton is recognized for point."

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, I want to take Representative Mautino's suggestion. And we an save some time of the House if we and Representative Parke mentioned this earlier. We'll take Amendments 9 through 19 and we'll adopt them on a voice vote, then we can...I'll with draw Amendment #20, and then we will then debate Representative Mautino's Amendments which gut all of these individual Amendments, then we'll move on."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has made new Motion, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a substitute Motion. If it is your desire to hear Amendments 9 through 19 on one Roll Call, they will be discussed before the vote. The question is, 'Does the Gentleman have leave to have all of these Amendments 9 through 19 heard on one Roll Call?' That issue is debatable. Does anyone wish to discuss that Motion? The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Kirkland."
- Kirkland: "I...I don't know what the Gentleman has in mind but I think we miss an opportunity, to here again as I said to shape in this House rather than have the insurance industry shape what a bare bones budget should be. And you know there seems to be switch in approach that I just don't understand, but whether it's by voice vote or otherwise, I don't think they should be all in one voice vote. And I think...if the..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich has objected also to it being done on one Roll Call, so with that objection, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Also want a Roll Call vote on each Amendment, because I think it's important to show how each...each Representative voted and then if they vote 'aye' on Amendment 22 to show how ridiculous it is voting for Amendments then wiping them out with a further Amendment. So, I think it's important to have a Roll Call vote on each Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Cullerton, I presume
 withdraws his Motion. And we'll go to Representative
 Klemm, on Amendment #9."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to respond to one of the previous Speakers who were talking about the influence. I guess he feels that insurance industry has on this Body. I've been sitting listening to each one and I'm

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

a small business man, and I'm concerned about providing some insurance policies so that everybody can have insurance and some affordable insurance. And I listen to my colleagues who are sitting around here and we're talking about each and every Amendment to find out if it's good and worthy or not. Nobody over here is talking to the insurance industry. We're sincerely looking at the Bill to find out if we can present a Bill that Representative Mautino is suggesting. That would at least allow those who do not have any insurance at least to have some kind of It may be basic in nature, but at least it's better then nothing. But I think at least we can do that, because we do have a policy that you can purchase that would have all the things that Representative Cullerton trying to ask for. That's available, but there's a policy there that may be worthwhile for somebody. So I. fact, don't like to be categorized, and I don't think any of my friends do, to think that somebody's in the pocket of the insurance industry because we are concerned about finding affordable insurance. It's wrong to make that illusion to the Body. It's wrong for people to think that's what's happening. 'Cause it's not on this side of the aisle, and I don't think it's happening on your side of the aisle."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Would you please clarify for me, the position taken by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has withdrawn his Motion to combine Amendments because there were objections from other Members. And you have already spoken in debate on this question. So what other points do you have to make?"
- Mautino: "I really don't want to take the time of my colleagues

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

in the House to go through 20 Amendments. I think it's unfair to them. And I think it's unfair for those people to be strung out and for some strange reason somebody using a vote against mammography, against the good intention of those legislators to put together a program. What I recommend we do at this time, to provide some assistance and some common sense to everybody here, please take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Bill 4048,
Representative Williams. Where is Mr. Williams?
Representative Williams? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Excuse
me. Representative Flinn, for what reason do you seek
recognition?"

Flinn: "Well, Madam Speaker, we love this."

Speaker Breslin: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record.

Insurance, Third Reading, House Bill 569, Representative

Mautino. Mr. Mautino, you want to call this Bill? Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 569, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Well. if the Members of the General Assembly loved the last one or liked the last one. They're going to love this one. Very simply put, there were Amendments filed to this legislation as well. I would not bring it back from Third to Second. So, I'd like to move forward with the key policy. The people of the State of Illinois through the information that was submitted both by insurance companies, the insurance department, media news stories on affordability both on health care and automobile coverage. We provided legislation that we hoped would address both of those questions. One, I just previously took out of This key auto policy does basically three things.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

It provides for a new section that would qualify under mandated provisions adopted by this House and Senate and signed by the Governor. The Compulsory Automobile Liability Insurance that went into effect placed some of the citizens of Illinois in a dilemma. They work, need their cars, but they cannot and would normally not purchase liability insurance because of the cost of insurance in some areas. Secretary of State, Jim Edgar, for our Appropriations Committee stated that there are about 1.5 million people that have not adhered to the new mandatory law that went into effect on January 1. What did is that we provided a new type of policy, that did not address the question of financial responsibility, when we adopted the provisions of compulsory 20-40-15 was the mandated coverage. This policy provides...this type of policy which is a key auto policy provides for 2500 injured person and 15000 for property damage. If you were in an accident with those same individuals that did not have any insurance those 1.5 million there would be no recovery. Because basically they do not have assets or very little assets. At least with this policy there is recovery lower than the compulsory but most importantly something. In three out of every accidents three out of four...three out of five accidents there is property This addresses that question, there's \$2500 worth of personal expense and wage loss coverage. The key policy is more affordable than present requirement. Ιt will improve compliance with the Mandatory Insurance Law. And persons who are currently uninsured will be able to purchase it. What we will do with this policy as well is to enlarge 10 point script of a different color, in other words not black and white print on the policy but for example red, so that the policy holder is informed

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

does not comply with compulsory. But it does provide them with the parameters, to purchase their license plate and still be in compliance, to the degree of 2500 and 15000 property. The specific provision that is important to remember. does not put that driver in compliance with the Financial Responsibility Law that stays at 20-40-15 It provides some coverage for those people who can't afford the cost of the insurance when it was implemented into the state law. An individual that would have assets would not purchase this type of policy because you would still be liable for that amount over and above the insurance policy. It is a, once again, a fair boned proposal that has been requested by individuals in the major metropolitan area after hearings concerning the cost of automobile coverage the State of Illinois. And the 1.5 million people that have not had or purchased coverage to comply with existing law. In most instances they're gambling. The fine is \$500 so they're gambling they're not going to have an accident or get picked up on a moving violation and therefore save a buck or two. I think the policy has to be, at least, on This is one of those that would provide for a program that is not up to par with the existing compulsory but it does provide something for those individuals. I move for its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 569. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Did you know it took me a long time to have what I thought was a dream become a reality? It was mandatory auto insurance. What House Bill 569 does is enable us to throw the baby out with the bath water. Mandatory insurance is only in its infancy. It's three month...three

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

and a half months old from its inception by law. I've got a great deal of respect for Representative Mautino. And I think he's been led astray a little bit by some of the facts that were presented to him. Certainly everybody doesn't comply with the laws that goes on the books. We've got people that commit murder and we've got laws against murder. And all of a sudden were expected to have percent compliance with mandatory insurance? It doesn't make very...it doesn't do very much for your intellect, if you're supposed to believe that. Now let me ask you something. What's more important a fender, a bumper, a hood, a mirror? That's what they want you to do they want you to cover the property damage for an automobile. But if you've got a child or an elderly person that's walking down the street or a passenger in your automobile and they become maimed. They can only collect up to \$2500 and that's it. There is no law suit, there's no ability for suffering for your medical problem. I ask you, what would you rather have? A brand new shiny bumper or somebody that's a little healthy because they were afforded the proper medical care? Think twice before you vote on this. I'm urging you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Countryman: "Representative Mautino, Is there an immunity provision for the agent and the companies in this Bill?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Countryman: "Is it absolute?"

Mautino: "Nothing around here is absolute."

Countryman: "But isn't the provision of the...of the Bill

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

absolute? It says it's an absolute immunity, if they sell this policy, they can't be sued for faulty advice or negligence or any conduct in selling the policy."

Mautino: "I believe it's sec...chap...ah...page...line 19, page 20, Insurer Immunity. No motor vehicle insurer, no key auto policy insurer and no employee of an insurance or insurance producer representing an insurer, shall be liable in any accident for damages on account of a selection of a key auto policy. Failure to make a selection of a key auto policy or failure to exercise any other option under the article."

Countryman: "If I...If I'm hit by somebody with one of these policies. Am I hit by an uninsured motorist?"

Mautino: "I'm sorry John. I missed that."

Countryman: "If I'm hit by somebody that has one of these key auto policies. Am I hit by an uninsured motorist?"

Mautino: "Maybe an underinsured."

Countryman: "Is it underinsured?"

Mautino: "I said it maybe considered an underinsured. I'm not an attorney. You guys would have to battle that out in court."

Countryman: "Well, could I collect the \$2500 that they purchased or is that only to...is that only for the people who are in the car insured by the key policy? Is it for third parties that \$2500?"

Mautino: "Only the people insured by the Key Auto Policy."

Countryman: "So, it doesn't affect me. So, in essence, am I correct in saying that all the people who are struck by people having key policies are hit by an uninsured driver except for property damage? Is that correct?"

Mautino: "Could be."

Countryman: "Are you certain you didn't go to law school? Now if I decide, and don't tell my wife, but if I decided to put

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- all my assets in my wife's name. Is there any reason why I couldn't put...buy this policy?"
- Mautino: "Anyone can buy the policy. But if you have some assets maybe you would reconsider putting everything in your wife's name. I'll tell you that right now."
- Countryman: "It may not be...it may not be a wise idea. But anybody can buy the policy. Is what you're saying. Is that right? And when they buy the policy then they've complied with the Mandatory Insurance Law. Is that correct?"
- Mautino: "But not the financial responsibility section. You still are liable for the 20-40-15 minimum."
- Countryman: "And the people who purchase the Key Auto Policy. Do they have to maintain the same insurance that you and I now maintain called Uninsured/Underinsured Motorists as a part of that policy?"
- Mautino: "No, but if you're Bill would have been passed which I did support and will continue to support. It would be a part of this as well, yes."
- Countryman: "Madam Speaker, Mr. Speaker, whose ever in the Chair at the moment. To the Bill, I rise in reluctant opposition because I have such esteemed respect for the Sponsor of this Bill. To this Bill, what the prior Speaker said is true. What we're doing though is eliminating mandatory auto insurance. If we want to repeal mandatory auto insurance then put that vote up on the board and let's vote But this policy really insures nothing about life It only insures really fenders. And fenders don't matter to me. Life and limb matter to me. I voted for mandatory auto insurance. This Bill is flawed. designed to cover a gap and it's really a fraud upon the public. People will go out and purchase insurance and say, 'I've got insurance'. But, what have they

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

They've got a little \$2500 coverage for those people who are in their car. But the person they hit, the pedestrian that they kill. If that person with a key policy is a drunk driver and they killed somebody there's no recovery, Ladies and Gentlemen. There's no recovery, that's injury to the people of the State of Illinois. And I urge you to yote 'no' to this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Giglio, in the Chair. Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Shaw: "Could...ah...would you tell us again. On page 20, line 19, what that section does?"

Mautino: "Page 20, line 19, I just read it that's immunity. That
means that your protected. I just read that a couple
minutes ago."

Shaw: "It means that...ah...is that the immunity...is that the Immunity Section 636?"

Mautino: "That's what it says. Yeah."

Shaw: "What are we giving immunity to now? What all are we giving immunity to? Explain that to us. That's what I want to know."

Mautino: "Well, you're giving immunity to those people as it pertains to fraud or misrepresentation. On this particular policy, we're selecting a Key Auto Policy which is less than the existing 20-40-15 that's our low."

Shaw: "I wanted to get to another one. Well, I wanted to ask you a question, isn't it true that we are given immunity to insurance companies that are now red lining? Doesn't this...doesn't this section do that?"

Mautino: "No."

Shaw: "But what we have done here. It doesn't say that we don't do that in here. It does say you're giving immunity to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

them. To the Bill. let me say this and I certainly I think intentions. And he's a good Sponsor had good Legislator and I admire him. But, certainly one of other Sponsors had talked about repealing...one of the other speakers had talked about repealing. If you want t.o repeal the Mandatory Insurance Act you should do that. But this Bill is doing 569 is doing is perpetrating a fraud upon the people of Illinois and particularly Black The insurance companies have contrived here an people. idea that there's a large segment, in the Black community people, that they do not want to sell regular insurance to those people. There is not a cap on policy here, certainly, they testified in committee that the policy might run \$100 or \$200. But there is no cap this policy and if I walk into my insurance agent. If he or she is unscrupulous they might sell me, and I happen be a homeowner, they might sell me this policy. I don't know I'm not an insurance person. I go out and hit somebody, kill somebody. I have this policy. That person. the family of that person that I have killed turns around and sues me, takes my home and everything. And then can't even sue the person that sold me the policy or the insurance company. That's what makes this a fraud upon the people of this state. At the insurance companies wanted to do something. You can buy regular insurance policies for \$402. I believe. And anybody that cannot afford a liability policy for \$402 they don't need to be They don't need to be driving. And I would ask the Sponsor this Bill to take another look at it and he might want to take it out of the record. Because I don't believe that he wants to be tarnished sponsoring legislation like this with the racial overtones of this legislation! believe that he wants to do that. And I don't believe that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

the good people of this Body wants to vote for a piece of legislation like this going to deprive hundreds of people possibly of their life savings. I don't believe that you want to do that. This Bill is flawed all the way through. When we...when we talk about my community, my community, it's 98% homeowners. The people out there buy insurance but let the insurance company forward and sell a regular policy a regular policy. Those people can afford it. And I don't think the people in my community object to that. But here you go..."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw, please bring your remarks to a close. We have the timer on five minutes."

Shaw: "Here you go come...under the guise of your going be...the insurance company is going to be giving the people There not giving them anything. If they want something. to do something for the people in my community. should offer them a regular policy and not get into that red lining. But if we vote for this rubbish we sanctioning red lining. That's what we are doing under that Section 6...ah...636. We are saying it's okay for the insurance companies to red line. I don't care what That's what we are saying. And I would ask everybody here, all the Members of this Body, not to vote this policy. Not to vote for this policy. It's not good for the people of Illinois and it's particularly good for the people of my community. And I would hope that you would vote this 569 down."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Weaver, the Gentleman from Coles, five minutes to explain your..."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll be...I'll be real brief because Representative Shaw pretty much covered all the bases. I think perhaps if we go ahead with this Bill and pass it into law. That we may need to get a great

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

big bumper sticker for the people who are insured under this Key Auto Policy. So that in case they hit each other they'll know who to sue, because neither one of them will be covered for personal injury up to the amount that it's going to take to get them out of the hospital. My point is that we've only been under mandatory insurance for davs. We've only had mandatory insurance for about four and a half months so far. While this may be a very good idea to look at further down the road, I think it's way way to early for us to start making changes. When we haven't really discovered rather mandatory insurance is working or not working. I think we need to wait a while give mandatory insurance a chance to work. Let Governor Jim Edgar...excuse me...Secretary Jim Edgar's plan work a little bit better before we try to make changes to it. And I think a 'present' vote is a very appropriate vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yeah, Representative Mautino, you mentioned that this was a key policy and I assume you voted for mandatory insurance? Did you not?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Terzich: "And you know what the purpose of the mandatory insurance was for?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Terzich: "And there wasn't any regard to what the cost would be for mandatory insurance, was there? It was good for the people. It was good for the people of the State of Illinois."

Mautino: "Yeah, that also has to be affordable so they can buy it."

Terzich: "It still is. Isn't it?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Mautino: "I don't know. There's 1.5 million people out there that can't afford it. So, I just want to address those people."
- Terzich: "Yeah, but that's not the point. I mean if the mandatory insurance is...that's why we have it is that if there can't afford to own a car. They shouldn't be able to...be able to drive it. They can't afford the insurance."
- Mautino: "I don't know, Bob. I would think that it would be very difficult for Legislators to say to 1.5 million people, 'I don't want you driving in the State of Illinois. I don't want to provide you with a policy that would give you some coverage.' I mean, I think that we've got to address 1.5 million people. It's not like 100 people. 1.5 million."
- Terzich: "Well. the people, I'm sure that the people, of the State of Illinois deserve to have all of the people that automobiles in the state to have insurance. operate Because we know that insurance is good for everybody and, therefore, this Bill is certainly out of place. We do have our minimum coverages. We mandated that they have the 20-40. We have the \$15000 property damage. And that certainly the uninsured motorist or mandatory insurance coverage certainly should be given a chance. It is a small price to pay for the people of the State of Illinois. millions of dollars that it costs to administer this program. But certainly now is not the time to tell all of these people of the State of Illinois that this key policy is suppose to meet the mandatory insurance requirements. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Clerk for an announcement."

- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar, Number 2 and 3 have been
 distributed."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to add to that. That

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

anybody that wants to be a Sponsor of these Bills that are on the Supplemental Calendar. Please come up to the well and sign. Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the...opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to the Sponsor of this legislation this is the worst piece of legislation I've seen come through here in a long time. Representative Weaver spoke against having a bumper sticker placed on the car of the insurance...of the people that would take this insurance. And I think the sticker should read 'Inferior'. This...the people in Springfield for the amount of coverage that they pay for full coverage. They could get a real good policy for same amount that the people would have to pay for this piece of legislation...for this insurance policy here. me this particular insurance policy or key policy is strictly for the people inside the City of Chicago. Because we're the ones that's having to suffer from the astronomical prices, from the red lining and the other so called inferior things that have to go on, when it comes to insurance. We the people of the City of Chicago are paying higher insurance premiums than any other place in the State of Illinois. So, for that reason I would truly hope that everyone in this Body would reject House Bill 569. And, again with all due respect to the Sponsor."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we are really getting pass the key issue

119th Legislative Day

Williams."

May 17, 1990

here. Which is there are a lot of people out there who aren't carrying insurance at all. If we're going to have bumper stickers. Well, let's put bumper stickers on their car that say 'I ain't got no insurance. You know. we're really talking about here is a large number of people who can't afford. I mean really honest. conscientious people who just can't afford it. They don't have assets to protect. So, what we're really talking about here is trying to take the situation we've got with mandatory insurance. Truth is historically on all the states where mandatory insurance has gone in. The maximum coverages. the maximum number of people who carry the insurance, that's very early on in the game. And it tapers off kind of where it was before. There just are a lot of people who never carry insurance. They're irresponsible or they don't have the money. So what we are really talking about is a proactive approach here. If you get caught without insurance you can be fined for \$500. One of our top carriers is talking about providing this coverage from anywhere from 190 to \$480. So, there's an incentive for people to take this policy. Now the truth is that while there is no liability coverage here for bodily injury/liability. The people who would be hurt by would be other people who don't carry insurance because all the rest of us have uninsured motorists coverage. we're really talking about is to help a situation that's not good. It does give those conscientious people who want some coverage an opportunity to provide coverage for four out of five claims. And we think it's a step in the right direction. And ought to endorse this approach and we improve the uninsured motorists situation in this state." Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Williams: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Williams: "Representative Mautino, would this if an insurance company offered this policy. And I may have missed what might have been said by Representative Shaw. If they offered this policy would they then be able to say...if they offered this policy in a certain area could they offer this policy and this policy only?"

Mautino: "No."

Williams: "So in other words..."

Mautino: "What makes you...what makes you think that that's a part of this proposal?"

Williams: "I'm just trying to see if by offering this policy you're giving the insurance company say...In some areas of my community it's hard to get full coverage. It's hard to get certain types of insurance because certain companies don't want to write in those particular areas. And..."

Mautino: "That's red lining."

Williams: "...they may have found themselves in trouble for red lining. I guess my question is, could they offer this policy in some sort of way get off the hook from offering full coverage or other source of coverage?"

Mautino: "I believe that full coverage for whatever type of policy the individual wants is available to those same clients as would be a Key Auto Policy. There is no intention of red lining anywhere."

williams: "I know there's no intent. I'm not trying...I'm seriously trying to figure out this piece of legislation. I'm one of those that betwixt and between voting for it in committee. Question in my mind too regards the original intent of mandatory insurance, as I understand it, had something to do to provide protection for not just the person who's driving but protection for other individuals

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

who may be injured by a person who is uninsured. This doesn't do that does it?"

Mautino: "No, that would be addressed by underinsured or uninsured on the other individual's your or mine coverage as well. This would provide only 2500..."

Williams: "What about a pedestrian?"

Mautino: "Pardon?"

Williams: "If you hit a pedestrian?"

Mautino: "It would not cover it to the best of my knowledge."

Williams: "To the Bill, I'm betwixt and between on this piece of legislation. I personally feel that the Sponsor's attempting to do or to provide a service that many people in my area may or may not need. In the sense that some insurance rates that are available in my neighborhood are extremely high and inaccessible. But at the same have concerns about offering a policy that does not in fact cover individuals who may be injured by someone's actions. And the only thing that we can tell them is that you should have had insurance yourself. This is a piece of legislation that I think well intentioned but I think there is to much confusion about it at this time. I don't think we clearly understand all of the ramifications of this legislation. And one of the reasons I'm speaking because I intend to vote 'present'. I'm not Because against what he's trying to do. I've talked to a lot of people on both sides and I don't even know if I've made a comment or not. I hope I haven't and I hope I don't break But I'm saying is that I just don't know enough about this at this time. I don't know whether I'm hurting or And until I do I don't think I'm in a harming someone. position to vote for this. And I intent to vote 'present' on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Five minutes to explain your vote."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This this coverage was designed for people that can't afford to buy regular auto insurance. It was designed to allow them to drive legally, allow them not to be fined \$500 if they're caught driving without insurance. Yes, I admit the coverage is not adequate. It doesn't address the serious issue of injury. But it's a question of whether this is in place or nothing. This Bill is to address the people. Maybe a woman raising three children has to drive to work, drive the kids to day care, risk turning the wrong way on a one way street or going through a yellow light, getting arrested. No insurance. 500 bucks, that lady can't afford \$500. Otherwise she would have purchased insurance. coverage will go down in cost. I do truthfully believe because as all insurance contracts go, if it's used, it's purchased. Other companies will enter the field. Competition will take place and the coverage will cheaper. I would urge it's not...it's not horrendously great Bill. But it's certainly something to address the poor people of our state."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich. Five minutes to explain your position."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Mautino, would you tell the Body who thought up the language 'key auto policy insurance'? Who brought up that term 'key'?"

Mautino: "I don't know. I guess it was presented...ah...so it would separate it from a regular policy. It came along with the first drafting after a hearing that was held by Senator Jones in the State of Illinois Building. If I remember correctly."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Matijevich: "Are there any assurances that there will be reductions in premiums or lower premiums? Are there any guarantees that premiums would be low? Because surely there's virtually no coverage."

Mautino: "There's no guarantees given. It was...if a...an insurance company said that if this weren't...The question raised, if this were in effect today what would the cost of that policy be? The gentleman answered '100...between \$169 and \$200 per year as opposed to approximately \$400 per six months."

Matijevich: "And I understand...ah...Allstate testified that they will charge as much as 450 for this key policy. now charge 455 in Chicago for its standard mandatory liability policy. In other words \$5.00 less with virtually no coverage. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the There's also no guarantee that this is only going House. to be used by those...there's a big pitch that designed for those who don't have insurance, the mandatory insurance coverage. But there's no guarantee that that's only who they're going to sell it to. They are going to, especially the fly by night companies, they are going to make a pitch for this type of insurance. And the reason why, for a pretty fare premium they actually don't have any coverage. So, it's a bonanza for the insurance companies. The current law we provide \$20000 for injury or death of one person in an accident, 40000 for injury or death more than one person in an accident. With this key...key auto policy nothing no bodily injury/liability only \$2500 for medical expense to the...ah...and wage loss to the policy holder. One more question, Mike Weaver mentioned the Secretary of State, does he have a position on this?"

Mautino: "I've not been contacted by the Secretary of State. I believe your question might better be raised to someone

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

else."

Matijevich: "Well, I think somebody should have because he credit for the Mandatory Insurance Law. Which right now we have really just started and we don't know the effects yet. And then we're going to put this type of a Bill on the books. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know I often here Members get up and say 'this is the worse Bill I ever saw.' We say it very often. But believe me this Bill is the greediest Bill. The greediest Bill that I have ever seen in my 24 years. This is a Bill of greed. Not a Bill of need. A Bill of greed. Everybody should vote against this Bill. It's actually going to pay insurance companies a lot of bucks really to tell people they now won't get arrested because they don't have insurance. This is a horrible Bill. I urge the Members to vote against it."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Please, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question's been moved. Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. It's been a long day on insurance and I thank the House for their indulgence. A couple comments have to make concerning statements that were made. Number 1, this legislation does not address nor is it intended to address the question or to establish red lining. Red lining is not legal in the State of Illinois. The question raised as it pertained to the pedestrian. I may have been mistaken in my answer when I provided that answer. In the Section, on page 9, 620.1 Accidental Bodily Injury, that means bodily injury including death resulting

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

therefrom arising out of the operation or use of a motor vehicle while occupying the vehicle which is accidental as to the person claiming the key auto policy insurance I guess the answer to that is that individual benefits. would be covered for up to that \$2500 of personal loss. The question here is not if that individual was covered only for 2500. If that person had no insurance at all and hit a pedestrian that individual has no coverage whatsoever no remuneration. We are trying with this legislation to address a segment of society that has found it financially to pay the premiums in certain areas of this state. This is a Bill for the little people. Just the last Bill on affordable health care was for the little people. I would hope that once they'd win one. your 'ave' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 569 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, one minute to explain your vote."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've never heard so much confusion on a very good idea as I've heard recently in this debate. This Bill is an attempt by the insurance industry to respond to the needs of the citizens of this state. Rather than being against legislation, rather than being against everything that's presented on this floor. they have come up with an idea that is worthwhile. This is a way of saying because there is a million and a half people, a million and a half people in this state with no insurance at all. That the industry, the insurance industry, is responding in a positive responsible manner and saying 'Alright, we have a bare bones policy that we're going to offer. It covers two out of the five...two out of...three out of five accidents that are fender benders.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

This covers it.' It at least provides you an I the citizens that get in a car accident that there will be some financial remuneration to you. I think this a good Bill and we should vote for it."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Morrow, one minute to explain your vote."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to place on the record that on House Bill 69...569. I have removed myself as a Cosponsor of this Bill. I cannot vote in good faith for a Bill where a car or damage to a car is worth more than damage to any human being. Those who have said that everyone is covered with uninsured vehicle coverage, motorist coverage. Alot of our young kids are out here playing right now and it's warm outside. They are not covered. I have also given several...three days ago I went to the insurance companies, and I gave them a chance...I gave them a chance to come up with a way in order to..."

Speaker Giglio: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Morrow: "I came up with a...I gave them a chance that they could...come back with something that I could vote for.

They have not done so. And I've just been given a note, I guess, in response to someone's question. Secretary of State, Edgar, is opposed to House Bill 569. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I've always been in support of compulsory liability insurance.

As a result insurance companies always said that the first year that this goes into effect there is a big...large number of people who pay their premiums. After that first year the number of people who have insurance drops off significantly. I think the insurance companies in good

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

faith are attempting to prevent that fall off that has been so traditional in every state that has ever had it. I think this is a cooperative effort and should be given a chance. So that 1.5 million people in the State of Illinois can get some coverage and still comply under the law rather than to pay a \$500 fine."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran, one minute to explain your vote."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I have a question."

Speaker Giglio: "You have a question?"

Curran: "Yeah, to ask of the Sponsor, the Sponsor perhaps can just shake your head. And I'm asking this because of the presentations that were made to me earlier before your Bill came on for discussion. Representative, if I have regular insurance full coverage. You have key automobile insurance. I have uninsured motorists. You have automobile insurance. You hit me and I have bodily injury. Now, earlier today I was told that my uninsured motorist would not work because you are insured with key auto. You are saying to me now by the shaking of your head 'no that is not the case. And, in fact, your uninsured motorist still kicks in because key auto does not obviate uninsured Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With that understanding I stand in support of this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Peterson, one minute to explain your vote."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Going back to a reference that was made earlier by one of the Representatives on Secretary Edgar's position. I know of no position on this Bill. I don't see his people working the floor. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on this particular Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

one minute to explain your vote."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd rise to just make a few comments. One, this policy I don't think has anything to do with racial overtones being. And one of the Speakers previously said that it's aimed at poor communities or aimed at the Black community act...well, that was my interpretation. Actually this Bill would help the little guy who has no assets. I think that it's not the best policy in town but it is a policy. The fact that there was one mention about insurance brokers and their ability to deceive people. Fraud is when you intentionally not tell a person what's involved in a particular policy. I do not see agents doing that. I think they're much more honorable people than to try to deceive someone. And if you would keep in mind that as agents they are paid by the commissions that they make on policies. A commission a 7 percent commission on a \$400 policy is \$28. A 7 percent commission on a..."

Speaker Giglio: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Representative, one minute."

Turner: "A 7 percent commission on a \$1500 policy is a \$105. And I would think that if an agent was selling insurance he would want to sell the policy that's going to bring about the most money for him. If he was interested in money only. This policy makes people who are now criminals by the law that we passed last year. It sort of frees up the jail cells, if we may say, because it at least gives them some coverage. True it may need some working and based upon the score board here. It looks like it will have to go back and be worked over. But I think this is a good attempt on the part of the insurance company. I support this legislation and I hope that we can do more to make it more admirable. So that we can achieve the 60 votes."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells, one minute to explain your vote."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't believe the red votes up there. I don't think your constituents are going to thank you. If I have a constituent who doesn't have very much money and can't afford a policy right now constituent runs into me. It's going to cost him \$500 and they're criminal besides. So this way they can buy a cost policy. At least they'll take care of the car for me and my own policy, because I'm a law abiding citizen and have insurance, will kick in. I can't see where the down side of this is. This is the policy that is made for the little guy. I think it does help those that are in low income jobs but need a car. I don't understand why vou're voting 'no'. Of course it isn't the best policy. It's not the Mercedes Benz. It's just a little Volkswagon policy but it's better than nothing. A half a loaf is better than nothing and they've got nothing right now except a \$500 fine."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Anthony Young, one minute to explain your vote."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason I am explaining my vote. I was asked a couple of questions by the previous Speakers. And the reason I'm voting 'no' is because this has been described as the Volkswagon. And we've talked about price but nothing in the legislation talks about price. And I'm afraid that this key policy will be sold in my community for very close to that full...to the price of full coverage. And, secondly, this is said it will bring the little guy in compliance with the law. But we still have financial responsibility laws. And if there're personal injuries under this policy that won't be paid. People will

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

be in violation of the financial responsibility laws, still lose their license. So, it's not necessarily cheaper and it won't bring them in compliance with all of our laws."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman, one minute to explain your vote."
- Saltsman: "Yes. thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm more fortunate than Representative Flowers and Representative Shaw. 'Cause we don't have any red lining in our district, which makes a lot of difference in our rates, and it makes a lot of difference in our feelings towards this legislation. I'm not really satisfied that there isn't a guarantee on a reduction on these premiums. But when I have a man and a woman call me up with seven children and work...they work a 40 hour work week making less than \$9 an hour between them because of the economy in the area. And cannot afford car insurance. They went two years without They went two years without an accident. They went two years without a ticket. And when they were forced to go get insurance they were throwed into the pool. caused them to pay about another 60% more than what their insurance normally was. This Bill isn't perfect. But people in my area need something affordable. And, as far as I'm concerned, it's the only show in town. We've got to send somebody a message that these people have to drive. And when you tell me 'they haven't got any right driving if they can't ... "
- Speaker Giglio: "One minute to explain your vote, Representative."
- Saltsman: "I...I don't think there's a person in this General Assembly that's got enough guts to go up and tell a man and a woman. Who are both working 40 hours a week for less than \$9 an hour between them 'you don't have a right to drive' and that's what happened to me. If this is the only

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

show in town we've got to do something for 'em. Or we've got to start something here."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis.

Representative Davis, one minute to explain your vote."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Davis. As I looked at the policy and as I listened to the debate. My question was, would the parents of those children who were playing ball recently want key auto insurance? There children were on a field playing ball. And according to this policy \$2500 would be the maximum of medical coverage that they would have gotten from that accident. Mandatory...all together...mandatory insurance was...was filed and passed in this House not to make people pretend to have insurance but for them to actually have it. We've only had this in effect for less than a year. I had the opportunity to talk to Secretary Edgar. He is opposed to this legislation. There are statistics showing how many people are driving with or without insurance yet. It is extremely..."

Speaker Giglio: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Davis: "If you buy insurance you should have it, not just a pretense. I say vote 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Munizzi. Representative Bugielski, one minute to explain your vote."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Davis stole part of my point that I was going to mention. We just had a major tragedy in Illinois in Riverside, Illinois two weeks ago. With a car being out of control going through a base ball diamond killing three innocent children who do not have uninsured motorists. What happens if something like this happens again and it could be even more fatal going through a school yard, a park, playground, anything. I'm sure that these people would be against it. \$2500 would not cover any bills. What happens if these

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

people...the children live are in a hospital for a long period of time there is nothing that would take care of these children in this Bill. And I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 51 voting 'yes', 58 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 569.

Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Postpone Consideration."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks Postpone Consideration.

 House Bill 982, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 982, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3304, Representative Regan. Representative Regan, House Bill 3304. You want this Bill called? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3004, (sic 3304) a Bill for an Act
 in relation to legislative proposals regarding health care
 coverage. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "There's something wrong there, Mr. Clerk, 3304."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3304, a Bill for an Act in relation to legislative proposals regarding health care coverage.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is introduced by me with the...ah...suggested by the State Chamber of Commerce. And it addresses health insurance costs that are rising through the ceiling. And one of the primary problems facing this state today is high health insurance costs. It simply says that if there's going to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

be additional mandates placed on health insurance policies that we prove that it's really required. And when we introduce it we show that how much did it raise the premium, how much the social effectiveness and the medical effectiveness is. And I would urge its passage."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Williams? Have all voted who wish? Clerk...Representative Shaw? Representative voting. Have all voted? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question, there's 93 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present'. House Bill 3304 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Leverenz? Representative Leverenz chamber? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Satterthwaite, 3941. Representative Satterthwaite. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. No, Representative Satterthwaite. Proceed."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to bring House Bill 3941 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill's been read a Second time previously.

 Floor Amendment #...Floor Amendment #4, offered by
 Representative Satterthwaite."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #4 rewrites the Bill to put it into the final form that we would like to have. There were some objections by the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Department of Insurance on the earlier version of the Bill. And we have tried to address that in this Amendment. I believe that the information that we are now asking for in this Bill is essentially provided in two different forms that are currently filed by HMOs. The concern is that some HMOs that are a part of an insurance company have not always been filing that. The Department of Insurance indicates that they will be pursuing the filing of this information by those HMOs. And I would ask that we adopt Amendment #4 in order to make clear that this is information that has to be provided by all HMOs weather or not they are part of an insurance company. I ask for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill came before the Insurance Committee and commitments were made that the HMOs would have to sign off on this. And quite frankly I don't know of any of the HMO companies that have been contacted. And the commitment was not just made to the Insurance Department (Sic — Department of Insurance). Representative Satterthwaite made a commitment that she would work it out with the HMOs and it's not my understanding that they have signed off on this. Representative Satterthwaite, would you be kind enough to give us some background on that commitment?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Yes, as I understand it even with Amendment #3, the HMOs were satisfied that this was not a problem. What we have done in addition to that in Amendment #4 is take out some language that the Department of Insurance was concerned about."

Parke: "Well, it's my understanding that there's still

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

proprietary information being requested through this legislation. That could put the HMOs who many of them are in a somewhat fragile position in the state in the first place. Releasing information that most businesses would not be released to competition to the competitors. And so unfortunately I am going to have to rise in opposition to this Amendment and to this Bill as a whole."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Chi...further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Pedersen: "Does the Department of Insurance approve this Bill?"

Satterthwaite: "Representative, I gave this language to the Department yesterday. I have not yet heard back from them after they have had time to double check it. They are pleased that we removed some of the language that was in there before. I have guaranteed them that if there is further problem that the Department has we will continue to address that need in the Senate. However, my understanding is that the information that we are requiring here is information that is already provided through the HMO reporting...that the Department of Insurance already gets from these HMOs."

Pedersen: "Then why is it necessary if they are already reporting it?"

Satterthwaite: "Because what has happened is HMOs that are now part of an insurance company have been trying to avoid providing this information. Or they through some misunderstanding think that the information that insurance companies have to file provides this. It is now provided in this form through the insurance information. And so the Department is planning to follow up and make these insurance companies...make the HMOs that are now coming

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- under the insurance reporting provisions also provide this information. Which they did provide when they were not under an insurance company which a pure HMO has to provide."
- Pedersen: "Do insurance companies have to provide this information to the Department of Insurance?"
- Satterthwaite: "Not specifically in this form that's the problem."
- Pedersen: "Well I mean in general. I mean if they're not part of an HMO do they have to...do they have to provide information? Or are the HMOs providing information, extra work, extra labor that the insurance companies don't have to provide?"
- Satterthwaite: "There are two separate booklets, one for insurance companies and one for HMOs. If an HMO is part of an insurance company this is where the problem arises. And so this language is meant to indicate that an HMO, even if it is part of an insurance company, has to file this information in addition to what it files as an insurance company."
- Pedersen: "No but what I'm asking is that if an insurance company doesn't have an HMO. Do they have to provide this information?"
- Satterthwaite: "No. No. Only if they have an HMO."
- Pedersen: "So, in other words, insurance companies really don't have to provide this information but the HMOs do."
- Satterthwaite: "That's right."
- Pedersen: "...An additional burden that the insurance companies don't have."
- Satterthwaite: "Well, if they're an insurance company without an HMO this doesn't apply to them. This only applies to HMOs."
- Pedersen: "Yeah, but insurance companies provide this kind of

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- coverage."
- Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry I didn't hear the...the..."
- Pedersen: "I said but insurance companies have to provide this kind of coverage. I mean they do. So if they are why aren't they required to do it?"
- Satterthwaite: "You would have to ask the Department. Why they would not require it of an insurance company. I don't know. I'm only trying to address the situation where an HMO is a part of an insurance company. And make sure that they provide the same information that HMOs have to provide when they are not part of an insurance company."
- Pedersen: "Are the in...are the HMOs supportive of this legislation?"
- Satterthwaite: "The last I heard there were no objections from the HMOs."
- Pedersen: "Well, thank you...ah...I...we heard this legislation in the committee. I don't really think it's necessary. And I would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the Lady from Champaign to close."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. By this Amendment I am simply seeking to put into final form in one Amendment. All that we agreed to do. If this Amendment does not go on I can still proceed with the Bill without the Amendment. However, I believe that this will bring it into compliance with what the Department of Insurance requested. The earlier Amendments, to my knowledge, already was acceptable to the HMOs. And so I am attempting by this Amendment simply to abide by the agreement that I made in the Insurance Committee when the Bill was heard there. I would seek your support in the adoption of Amendment #4."
- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Lady now asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call for immediate consideration. Have leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk. Alright, Bills remaining on Third Reading, House Bill 982. Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder on House Bill 982, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 982, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a technical correction not a substantive change. We in previous law had referred to an Insurance Financial Regulation Fund. However, that is an incorrect name it should be the Insurance Financial Regulation Administrative Fund and that's the purpose of the Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 982. And on that any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yeah, Representative Ryder, I know this is substantial legislation but why wasn't this put on the Consent Calendar? Was there something you said or did that didn't make the Consent Calendar?"
- Ryder: "I've been nervous all day, Representative. I'm sure that there's some transgression for which I've not atoned. And as a consequence this meager piece of legislation, which is probably not substantial by any stretch of the imagination, didn't make it on that list. If I've offended someone I seek apology. If there's something I said or didn't say or

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- did or didn't do. You know, I humbly, humbly ask to atone for those situations. Is there something else that I can do for you?"
- Terzich: "Yeah, use it in your campaign literature. It will probably carry you over."
- Ryder: "I'm not even sure that I can spell correctly the fund.
 But I do my best. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ryder to close. Question is, 'Shall House Bill 982 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 982 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3683, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3683, a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Maintenance Organization Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3683 is the corrective piece of legislation for what we passed last year which is Public Act 8673. This would allow the pharmacists the independent pharmacists to access the HMO contracts. As we passed out of here last year and there was a flaw in it. And it didn't go into the correct statute. I would ask for your 'aye' vote to pass this Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,

 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

McCracken: "Is the same as the Bill last year or is this a little different?"

Leverenz: "This is the same and a little different. In as much as what we passed did not go into the proper part of the statute to cover everything we were trying to do as we thought we did. So, last year I guess we passed the legislative intent. This year we're actually passing the whole Bill."

McCracken: "Are the opponents still the same?"

Leverenz: "We had no opponents in committee that I know of and no one came to the table to speak against it."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3683 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill 3683 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4032, Representative Matijevich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4032, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I sponsored House Bill 4032 for the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois. House Bill 4032 would clarify existing law that in downstate fire fighters group health insurance plans where there is a continuation privilege for retired and disabled fire fighters. Such benefits are a supplement to Medicare coverage. The Bill would have a minimal cost impact because: 1) most funds are now considering the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

continuation privilege as a supplement to Medicare coverage; and 2) absent a contrary provision in collective bargaining agreements the retired or disabled fire fighter is liable for the payment of both the employee and employer share of the group insurance premium. I would ask you to support House Bill 4032."

McCracken: "Yes, I...I'm not sure how much the cost would be. We had a mandate note and...ah...it...it couldn't give us a figure. But the municipalities are opposed to this. They do anticipate increased cost. I don't know what or how much it will be. You know, this is another case of a mandate. Only in this Bill rather than ignore the mandates as we usually do. We expressly exempt this from the Mandates Act. I don't think that's good policy. If...if we haven't got the courage to pay for it. I don't know why we should lay it off on the municipalities."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Well, as I said it would...the impact would be very minimal because most of the municipalities are considering it as a continuation and a supplement to Medicare right now. And we wanted to make the law perfectly clear. So I would urge the passage of House Bill 4032."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4032 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are are 86 voting 'yes', 24 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 4032 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

on House Bill 4032. Mr. Clerk, let the transcripts so reflect. House Bill 4042, Representative Bowman, on Revenue, Third Reading, Revenue, House Bill 4042. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4042, a Bill for an Act in relationship to information on the Federal Earned Income Tax Credit.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Bowman." Bowman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill does not provide for Earned Income Tax Credit but it provides for notification of people's rights under the Federal Law. The problem right now is that a lot of people are eligible for this Earned Income Tax Credit which would actually provide the working poor with a substantial amount of money, perhaps as much as \$874 per year and that they could claim this benefit from the Federal Government. But many people fail to claim this benefit for the simple reason that they don't make enough money to even have to file an income tax form in the first place. Consequently, they don't file their tax form. There's no penalty 'cause they're not required to but at the same time they miss out on this benefit. So what law...what the Bill does is to provide two mechanisms; one through employers and one's through the Department of Public Aid, for notifying people of their rights under the Federal Statute. We offered...we put on an Amendment earlier today which removes the opposition that...ah...of any employer group in the state. As far as I know there is no opposition to the Bill at this time. So I now move for its passage."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, I don't oppose the Bill. I just mourn the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

passing of an opportunity to afford tax relief to the citizens of our state. We should've considered Amendment #2 on the merits. It provided an Earned Income Tax Credit for families with small children. Would have allowed mothers to stay with their children if they so desired or at least make it more affordable to do so. We missed that opportunity to even have a vote on it and that is a sad..a sad thing. So I take no joy in voting for this Bill although there is no reason to oppose it."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just trying to clarify what this Bill...ah...what the impact is. Representative Bowman is sponsoring this Bill having to do with an income tax credit and Representative McCracken is in favor of it. Is this a first in the Illinois General Assembly? Or is this just because it's Bowman's last Bill again?"

Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have this Bill heard on Third Reading?"

Unknown: "Yes."

Speaker Giglio: "By the use of the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm always happy to give my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Representative McCracken, an opportunity to make a speech. He does it so very well. It's not not often that he, however, makes a speech about a piece of legislation which isn't even pending in front of us which is what he just did. I would point out to my Republican friends that he did say that he was supporting the legislation or at least that there was no reason to oppose the legislation. So I just urge everyone to get on board and vote for this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Bowman, there was an inquiry of

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- the Chair that there was a statement made that you asked for your last Bill some time ago. Have you changed your position and you want another Bill?"
- Bowman: "No, that was my...um...actually it was the first in a series of last Bills."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor of House Bill 4042 vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 4042 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order of Business will be Elections. The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern, you have three Bills. Elections, House Bill 3824. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3824, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to take it back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Stern: "Amendment #1 is our omnibus Elections Bill for this year and I will give you all the things that are in it which are multiple. It has been negotiated and agreed to by both sides of the aisle. I don't believe there are any objections to any of it. But let me give you in summary what it is and if it goes on to long stop me."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Stern and Rice."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stern, on Amendment #1."

Stern: "You've just heard the introduction. Ιt includes approximately 18 or 20 Bills: one of which deals with Aurora only; one of which deals with the date for swearing in for Chicago Alderman which for some reason was never put into the Code; one deals with deleting a piece of law which says that 'if handicapped voters can be carried into a polling place it complies'. In fact, the handicapped voters did not like that they wanted that removed. wanted to be able to wheel themselves in as necessary. There is a Bill on judicial vacancies and how they are to be ascertained. There is a Bill on keeping the Election Authorities Office open during a challenge examination of signatures. There is an item that says that when the information is sent from the Election Authority to the state board it shall include voter history. There item that says that from hereinafter, this must be the McCracken Amendment, State Central Committeeman Female will be known as State Central Committeewoman. A qualified primary elector may not sign petitions for nor candidate in the primary of more than one party. deletes language that was made obsolete by a legal decision many many years ago. There is one that says an absentee voter may go to the polls and if his ballot is there has not been counted. He may vote and that ballot will be marked void the original one that was there. There is that deals with caucus participants not being eligible for running as a candidate on a new political party or independent slate. There is one that deals with the...there are two state board of election Bills that deals...one deals with the second business day after receipt of an Objector's Petition instead of first business day after. Because it gives the state board an opportunity

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

at least to get the proper papers together for mailing out. There's one that deals with how the state board of elections shall notify upon receipt of an Objector's There's another item that says that for...within Petition. 10 business days after an election the County Clerk's Office shall have a list on file of all those who served as election judges, their party and their polling place. now on the Temporarily Absent Student Ballot will be sent by nonforwardable mail instead of by certified or registered mail. In precincts where the ballot...ah...let I can't read my own shorthand. Oh...ah...in precincts where the ballot is counted within the precinct the Certificate of Results shall be the official all the wav to the canvas. In...in election authorities...election districts where...You want me to run down? It's enough already? Ah...where the count is done centrally 2% of the precinct shall be recounted manually. And that is just about it. There is one other, one other area that is slightly...ah...no, I don't think it's controversial. There is one other item that says that at a municipal primary election where the polling places are not open. A public question cannot be added to the ballot unless the polling places covered by that area would have been open anyway. That is the whole omnibus 3824. I'm going to ask questions. No."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake,
Representative Peterson."

Peterson, W.: "Would the Representative yield for a question?"

Stern: "You bet."

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Peterson: "Representative, the last part of your omnibus Bill regarding the municipal election. Is that...it's my understanding that now that school districts and any other

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- unit of local government. If they care to have a referendum have now been limited to four times in two years instead of the five?"
- Stern: "Instead of having their...that public question on the ballot in March...in February they could have it on in April. But that is correct it will limit them to four instead of five."
- Peterson, W.: "Alright, thank you, Representative. To the Bill, the Bill basically is pretty good except for the last provision which I object to. Years ago when the Election Code was changed and we gave units of local government five dates for these questions. They gave up a multitude of dates to go into the new Election Code. Now what we've done because some people have said 'We don't want to spend the money on our local counties in case there is a question. 'Cause we're going to limit those units government to four and next year limit it to three and after that maybe we won't have any.' I know that's an extreme but five out of 700 plus days and now four out of 700 plus days. I don't think it's fair to school districts or other units of local government. And because of that fact I urge a 'no' vote on this omnibus Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Myron Olson. The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield for a question please?"
- Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Representative Stern. Could you please tell me whether the provisions of House Bill 3203 are contained in this Amendment. That's the Bill that was originally sponsored by you, Representative Churchill and Representative Frederick. 32..."
- Stern: "I'm sorry. I can't identify it that way right this

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

minute. I haven't got my..."

Cowlishaw: "This is the one that I believe was proposed by the Lake County Clerk...has to do with prohibiting referenda and..."

Stern: "Oh, that's the one we're talking about."

Cowlishaw: "Right. That is contained in this Amendment. Is that correct?"

Stern: "That is contained in this Amendment, yes. I'm sorry.

The question was, you want me to describe it further?"

Cowlishaw: "No, I just wanted to make sure it was contained.

Pardon me. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Stern: "It was not...may I just correct one thing?"

Cowlishaw: "Yes."

Stern: "It was requested by the Lake County Board not by the Lake County Clerk."

Cowlishaw: "Okay, thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Cowlishaw: "First, I think we ought to commend the Sponsor of this Amendment for an excellent job, of taking a large stack of Bills on various elements of the Election Code, and trying to put together an Omnibus Bill that included a lot of things for a lot of people on both sides of the aisle including something for me. And I am greatful for that. The only thing I would caution is that there is one portion of this Bill which was proposed originally by the Lake County Board which is opposed by school districts, community college districts, park district and library districts. Other than that one portion I can't find anything else in this Amendment that would be objectionable at all. But I just wanted to caution you about that one objection. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on the point that the previous two Speakers have discussed. And let's discuss it for a moment and let's think it out thoroughly. What we're doing in this Amendment is we're eliminating the February election when an April election is coming up if only one referendum appears on the ballot I believe. means we're running an election, we're sending that generally five election judges to every precinct to sit around there and file their nails and read their books while we run one referendum. When we consolidated elections a good many years ago we did it for a number of And those reasons were: the cost effectiveness of consolidated elections; the professional elections that would result by having professional election authorities run the election over a two year cycle. No guarantees were made to anybody that we couldn't eliminate some of these elections. Now we came out of the dark ages of elections in Illinois in the 1980's and I'm glad to say that we've moved ahead. Not at the speed I'd like to see us move but this Bill is one more step in moving ahead to bringing some realistic election reform to Illinois. And what it does is it saves the taxpayers some dollars. So what you decision has to be on this Amendment is whether you want to save the taxpayers the burden and expense of having all these election judges sit around for one little referendum some particular district in February. When they could have that same referendum on in April of that year and whether you want to spend those dollars. Now I'll tell you in my district people that went to put a referendum up in February would probably get blown out of the Because the one issue that the taxpayers understand is it costs big bucks to run that election. And the other is that the antigroups, if that's what they're worried

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

about, are going to come out in droves. It's a single issue election. It's crazy. People ought to go to the township election where the voters or the...ah...election judges are working and cast their ballots at that time. We'll save a great deal of money. We'll have professional election. It's a good Bill. I filed a Bill which isn't in here that would eliminate the school election. It's a crazy election. It's a waste of money but I know I'm going to get somebody complaining to me afterwards. But let's take that money that we save and let's pay those election judges for the hard work that they give us on the other days. Let's not cost the taxpayers money just to save a few special interests in this state. Let's vote for this Bill. And I commend the Sponsor getting it in there. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Myron Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I was off the floor just when the Bill was introduced. But I want to bring you up to speed of what we've accomplished here in the last two years. As you know we went about four years without needing an election through the efforts of Representative Stern and others on that side of the aisle. The people on our side of the aisle we have put together, after diligent hard work on the members of our staff, a package which has been thoroughly reviewed a bipartisan Bill. We have made accommodations to take care of some peculiar or some particular interests relative to the Democratic National Committee. there's a precedent for it because we did it a year ago. And I would urge everyone to vote for this package because this is eminently good for them. And we have met the needs and the...and the efforts that the State Board of Elections

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

has requested. I think we should have a unanimous vote on this election package."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Anthony Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Young, A.: "I just have a couple of questions, Grace, just to make sure. Sometimes these packages change from the draft to the final package. There's language in the Bill that deals with automatic elections. None of that language applies to the City of Chicago does it?"

Stern: "...I don't know. I don't know Toney. I don't think so."

Young, A.: "It didn't yesterday. I was just wondering..."

Stern: "If it didn't yesterday...if it didn't yesterday it doesn't today. Because the Bill has not changed from yesterday to today."

Young, A.: "Then there's also language in the Bill that deals with notice requirements for judicial vacancies."

Stern: "That's correct."

Young, A.: "None of that language affects the Judicial Redistricting Bill that we passed last Session does it?"

Stern: "No, it doesn't."

Young, A.: "Okay...that...thank you."

Stern: "You bet."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stern to close."

Stern: "I...I think you've heard a pretty thorough airing more than you probably wanted to know. This is a bipartisan negotiated Bill and good government. I hope you'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3824 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Excuse me, Amendment. Excuse me, Amendment #1. This is Amendment #1. All those in favor of Amendment #1 signify by saying 'aye',

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments? Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Lady asks leave now by the Attendance Roll Call to hear immediate consideration. Hearing none, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3825 (sic 3824), a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stern, House Bill 3825, Third Reading."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, anything I would say would be repetitive. I hope you remember every word from the last discussion. And that you will vote 'aye' on House Bill 3824."
- Clerk Leone: "That's House...House Bill 3824, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Deuchler: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Deuchler: "Representative Stern, did you mention something about the Aurora Election Commission?"

Stern: "There is...ah...House Bill 3005 which Representative Cowlishaw had in which dealt with a situation only in Aurora where following the census and the redistricting. A portion of Aurora might be left without an alderman as I understand it except for this Amendment. If you want to hear more about it I'll ask Representative Cowlishaw."

Deuchler: "Well, that's sufficient, thank you."

Stern: "Okay."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3824 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk...Preston 'aye'. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. House Bill...House Bill 3824 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3825, Representative Stern. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3825, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker, may I bring 3825 back to put on an Amendment?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. The Lady have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 being offered by Representative

Stern and Rice."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Stern on Amendment #1."

Stern: "House Bill 3825 and this Amendment deals with the Bill we passed last year. It was Mr. Giorgi's Bill that permits campaign committees to hold lotteries. And...this kind of tidies up that Bill with definitions and...that's about it. That's all that's in that Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Stern: "Yes."

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Countryman: "Is this the Bill that Representative Mautino and I filed? Is it the same language that was in that Bill?"

Stern: "Yeah, I believe so."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Countryman: "I think it was Mautino — Countryman not Countryman —

Mautino. 2934? I mean is it the same language that was in
2934."

Stern: "I don't...Yes...I'm sorry."

Countryman: "This is what the State Board of Elections wants to clean it up? Is that correct? Is that right? Okay, thank you."

Stern: "Okay."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Stern: "Yes."

Olson, M.: "Just for the record asking the question because I have a constituent inquiry at home and it may occur to some other people. On this campaign, does this preclude any campaign groups that have been formed since when we passed the Bill last year from actually the raffles this year?"

Stern: "I believe it precludes any campaign organizations that is less than a year old from holding a raffle."

Olson, M.: "I'm going to support this measure. But just for the record I think we should look at this when another opportunity comes along because it means for candidates for all offices whether it be county, state or other. If their campaign committee was officially formed less than a year ago, and remember we had the primaries this last year, they would be precluded from taking any advantage of this opportunity. So we might want to look at this another time."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be some confusion over here as to whether this Amendment has been printed and distributed. If so we don't seem to have

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

it."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk?"

Black: "I know. I know. Is it out?"

Speaker Giglio: "Our records indicate that the Amendment has been distributed, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "Will ask Representative Hultgren.

 Representative Hultgren, do you have this Amendment?

 Representative Stern to close."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You have heard a discussion of the Bill. It deals with only one subject.

 It is very limited and has agreed upon by the task force.

 I hope you will vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Gentleman...Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, another inquiry of the Chair, the copy we just received is not the Amendment that's on the board. I would still ask if the Amendment in question has been printed and distributed."
- Speaker Giglio: "After re-examination, Representative Black, we'll take this Bill out of the record. The Amendment has not been distributed."
- Black: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Giglio: "House Bill 3826, Representative Stern, are you ready for this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3826, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Amendment to this has been printed and distributed yet either. I think we will take it out of the record."
- Speaker Giglio: "Take it out of the record. The next Order of Business will be Banking. Anthony Young. Anthony Young.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

On the Order of Banking appears House Bill 934. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Anthony Young. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Young."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."

- Anthony Young, A.: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to return House Bill 934 to Second Reading."
- Speaker Giglio: "Let the Clerk read the Bill. Let the Clerk read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 934, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning consumer credit. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to have the Bill be brought back to the Order of Second Reading for the apparent purpose of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Anthony Young."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Young."
- Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was the Amendment worked out with the Illinois Bankers Association and those who were opposed to the original Bill when it was heard in committee. It provides that...it puts a three year time before credit. Excuse me. It puts a three year period of time for which credit references can still be used against a creditor. It adds a statement that it does not stop an institution from considering an individual's financial ability to repay a loan. It also changes some consumer reporting requirements. And makes the Federal Law which is currently applicable to consumer reporting agencies a civil rights violation here in the State of Illinois. Move for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave now for the immediate consideration by the Attendance Roll Call.

Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 934, a Bill for an Act concerning consumer credit. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Young."

Young, A.: "The Bill basically does as I explained with Amendment #1. I move for its passage."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. This is final action. House Bill 934. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 934, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1368, Representative Levin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning financial institutions. Third Reading of the Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 1368 is a very simple Bill. It deals with automatic teller machines (ATM) and provides that the financial institutions charge may not for an ATM transaction in excess of what they would charge for a normal checking transaction. You know, when the industry was seeking permission from the Congress and the Federal Trade Commission and from the state for authority to establish electronic banking, the commitment and promise was this will save money by eliminating the need for tellers and that that savings would be passed on to the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

consumer. In fact, the statistics suggest that that was accurate. That the average cost of an ATM transaction is twenty-five cents. The average cost of a teller assisted transaction is a \$1.00. What this legislation does is to tell those very few financial institutions that if they said 'we want to make a profit on the ATM by imposing this surcharge' that they should not be able to do that. That the amounts of the checking transaction should be the maximum amount that they should be able to charge for an ATM transaction. I know this enjoys an awful lot of support from consumers. If there are any questions I'd be happy to answer them. Otherwise I'd simply ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Giglio: "...has moved for the passage of House Bill 1368.

Any discussion? The Gentleman from Dupage, Representative

Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very very much. Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman answer a question, please?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Under the present circumstance doesn't the competitive market place function in such a way to deal with this issue?"

Levin: "Representative, the commitment that was made to the Congress and to the Federal Trade Commission was that this was not going to be used as a profit endeavor. That...in fact, there would be a savings and that that savings would be passed on to the consumer. I don't think nobody's arguing here that there should not be a charge and that charge should be whatever they charge for the checking transaction. If it's a quarter that's fine. If it's a dollar whatever the checking transaction charge that should be what it is. But the commitment was made by the financial industry when they were seeking permission that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

they were going to save money and that they would pass on those savings. We're not even saying pass on the savings. We're simply saying here 'you've got people use to using these machines.' They...the cost to the industry is less than a teller transaction. So, we're saying 'you shouldn't be able to charge more than what you do for a checking transaction whatever that is.' We don't regulate what that is. We don't put any limitations. We just say whatever you...your the arrangements between you and your bank is when you go cash a check that should be the maximum amount they can charge on an ATM transaction. Treat it the same way."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much for an explanation. I have an ATM card and use it through the local bank and there are...there are no...there are no charges...levied for that...in any way, shape or form. They may make...it may be beneficial to them because I don't drive through where they have a...a...a. teller. But it just seems to me that...this kind of legislation is...is superfluous. And I just have serious reservations that we need to clutter up the statute books with this kind of language. And I guess maybe for that reason more than any other. I stand in opposition to this legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussions? The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Parcells: "If a bank could prove that the ATM is costing him a dollar. Maybe they felt in the beginning it wasn't going to but because the machines break down they are expensive. You're saying that he can't charge more than the teller who besides cashing checks does a lot of other transactions. So maybe the cost of the checks is really only a quarter

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

for the teller and even though they intended that the ATM would not be more. It is in fact now they can prove it's fifty, seventy—five cents or a dollar. You're saying they can't retrieve their cost. Their choices then would be, as I understand it, they can raise the cost of the check along with the cost of the ATM or they can close down their ATM. Is that right?"

Levin: "Clerk...fine...Representative, the figures that I quoted before are not my figures, they're not consumer figures, they are the figures that come from the industry. That the average cost of a teller transa...teller assisted checking transaction is a dollar. And that the average cost of an ATM transaction, which is one that doesn't use a human being, is twenty-five cents. So these are not my figures, these are not figures from a consumer group, these are industry figures that I have cited. And they are consistent with the testimony of the industry when went before the Congress and the Federal Trade Commission seeking permission. And that is they fully expected that they were going to save money by being able to go to electronic banking being able to go to ATM's, because they would not have to hire as many tellers and pay the salaries to those tellers. In actual fact there are fewer tellers, in actual fact they are saving money. So, this is I think cost justified legislation. You know, it's not a matter of the two figures being close the two costs being close the ATM transaction only costs a quarter as much as the teller transaction. If they were close I would think you probably would be right. But these are not my figures these are the industry figures. What we're saying the commitment that was made to the Congress to the Federal Trade Commission to the consumers..."

Parcells: "But both of the...at what time? When were those

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

statements made?"

- Levin: "Those figures...those statements were made approximately eight to ten years ago."
- Parcells: "Right, and I'm saying things could have gone up.

 Maybe ATM machines..."
- Levin: "Oh no. The figures are new figures. The commitments I'm talking about was the testimony before the Congress was eight to ten years ago. But the figures the twenty five cents and the dollar are current figures. These are figures which come from current industry publications."
- Parcells: "But if in fact they could prove that their costs of ATMs are up. Wouldn't there only selections...things to do would be to either close down the ATM entirely or raise the price of checks? So that they could eat up some of the costs of the ATMs with the checks. In other words if they charge fifty cents for both that would cover the cost of both of them. I mean are you liable to see a check going up is what I'm wondering?"
- Levin: "Representative, you know, if I think things should be cost justified and that's why I'm supporting this legislation because I think that the fees should be cost justified. In actual fact the right now this is pure profit over four times over and above their actual cost. I would agree with you that if in fact the ATM transactions were more expensive then users ought...there ought to be a surcharge. But that is not the case and this legislation is cost justified. And by the way there are not that many banks, financial institutions that are charging. I'm aware of four at this point. But this is I think legislation which is...You know, it's in part intended to treat everybody the same way and make sure it is cost justified."

Parcells: "Thank you, for your answers."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Piel."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just out of curiosity what is this going to do to the small ATMs small companies with To me when you start putting a cap on them right away is...You know, taking away the competition. know, to me it's going to hurt the little And...because the big quy is going to absorb losses where the little guy can't. I think...You know, to the Bill, I'm going to make it very brief, Mr. Speaker. I think when you sit here and you're talking about the...You know, different companies are in the...automatic teller business. think this is generally going to hurt the small ones. And I think if you take a look at your analysis and you The very very strongest are going to be the Commissioner of Banks, Commissioner of Savings and Loans, the bankers, Household International, gas station whatever it was. They're all against this. The entire industry is against this. Rather it be the little people, the big people they're all against it. And I think because what you're doing. You're putting a lid on this and your taking away the competitive market and the marketplace. And I would ask for a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Will the Gentleman yield? Would you please tell me a single one of these networks in the state that is making a profit from the ATM service?"

Levin: "Representative, there are at present time, I believe there are. I'm aware of four financial institutions in this state that are imposing a surcharge an extra charge for their customers' ATM transactions. As of, I believe, April 1st the First National Bank imposed a charge in my area, in my district. The Bank of Ravenswood has imposed a charge. There are at least two others which I don't have

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

their names right in front of me. The amounts of these charges vary between twenty-five cents for a transaction and a dollar per transaction. I believe the First National Bank's is volume based. So that it doesn't kick in on the first transaction. It kicks in on, I believe the sixth transaction. So there's a variation between twenty-five cents and a dollar in terms of the charges that are currently in place. You know, happily it's only a very small portion of the financial institutions that are imposing a surcharge. And the reason I think that they're not doing it is because they know that they're more than recouping their cost. And in fact, you know, the teller transaction is more expensive than the ATM transactions. So they don't think that is justified. You know. why I don't think we're seeing that much of it but we are seeing it with respect to some institutions."

Leitch: "Well, your idea is that the reason they're not doing it is what now?

Levin: "I think, you know, the vast majority of financial institutions know what their costs are and they know that they are more than recouping their costs through charging simply their normal checking charge and whatever that is. And whatever you negotiate with your bank as your normal checking processing charge. It may be a quarter, it may be fifty cents, whatever that bank is charging you. They would be able to charge under this Bill. We're just saying there shouldn't be a surcharge, there shouldn't be an additional charge. And we think that most banks and financial institutions know that, know what the costs are here, and therefore are not imposing a surcharge."

Leitch: "Well, I'm not aware of any charges for routine transactions. And certainly in downstate Illinois there are charges for such things as using a CIRRUS Network if

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

you're like in New York City and draw out money withdraw money from New York or some other part of the country. I think the reason why there are virtually no charges maybe there are a few in the Chicagoland area, I'm not aware of them, is because of the fact that the competitive system is working very well. There's great competition between these various networks and, in addition to that, none of these networks has been very profitable at all. And that's why they're so often consolidating throughout our state to try to recoup and become more efficient because of the extreme capital investment required to put this...put for this. I don't know where you got some of this information. great respect for the Sponsor but it does not match the reality that I know and certainly in my organization experiences. And I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, it's a free...we have a free country. There are all kinds of banks, there are all kinds of banks out there that have automatic tellers, there are all kinds arrangements where you can cash checks. If you really think that the automatic teller fees are to high it's very easy to go somewhere else. I mean, I can cash a check over at the Jewel for twenty-five cents. And, you know, those guys if it's a check for a \$101 instead of a 100 they want fifty cents. Well, you know what, I never write a check for over \$100. All these things do in a free marketplace is cut down services because nobody is going to provide a service at a loss. So if they think that they need the money to do this and you tell them 'they're going to lower the cost for them by law.' You know, micro-managing again. They're just going to stop providing the service. So, you

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

know, there's always a ripple when government gets into it and, you know, it really doesn't solve any problems. If it's in the day time and you're going to go into the bank itself. They're charging a dollar outside you can do it inside for twenty—five cents. Lord, we've got more choices. Why are we fooling around with this kind of stuff? I'd recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin to close."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've had a thorough discussion. The only thing I would point out is that I know of very few financial institutions that charge their customers for a deposit. You know, the checking...usually you're charged if you make a withdrawal by check maybe a quarter, maybe thirty-five, maybe fifty cents. I know of few that charge for deposit. And yet those institutions that are imposing a surcharge on ATM transactions are imposing that surcharge not only for withdrawals but for deposits as well. This Bill doesn't say you can't charge. It says the amount of the charge should be the same as for the checking transaction. I just ask for your favorable vote on House Bill 1368. It's a good consumer Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 1368 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren, one minute to explain your vote."

Hultgren: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege for myself and for all 117 Members of the House. Can you advise us as to when we're going to eat?"

Speaker Giglio: "I believe the tentative time is 7:00 p.m." Hultgren: "Thank you, Sir."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 37 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no' and 22 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared House lost. Bill 4207 (sic 4208), Representative Davis. Mr. read the Bill. Clerk, Representative Davis. Davis."
- Davis: "May I have leave to bring this back to Second for an Amendment?"
- Speaker Giglio: "40...4208. 4208. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4208, on the Order of Second Reading,

 Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Monique

 Davis."
- Davis: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #3, Mr. Clerk. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Davis, on Amendment #4 to House Bill 4208."
- Davis: "Amendment #4, Mr. Speaker, actually becomes the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Davis.

 Representative Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Davis: "Yes, it is."
- Speaker Giglio: "Lee, Mr. Clerk. Clerk indicates that the
 Amendment has been distributed. Amendments have all been
 printed and distributed, Representative Piel.
 Representative Davis on the Amendment."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 does become the Bill and it states that banks and savings and loans will

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

now cash Public Aid checks. We satisfied a requirement of the bankers and that is that they be allowed to issue their own identification, as well as requiring three pieces of identification: a drivers license, state identification card, the recipients medical card. Or any other three pieces of identification that's a picture identification. We also included in this Amendment that the payee must immediately report to the Department any loss or stolen checks. And the Department is in agreement with this piece of legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. First, an inquiry of the Clerk, what Amendments are on the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Davis: "I didn't hear you, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "It's an inquiry to the Clerk. Mr. Clerk, how many Amendments are on the Bill?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendments #1 and 2."

McCracken: "And you withdrew 3, Representative Davis? Okay."

Davis: "That is correct."

McCracken: "Alright. Alright. Now is this substantially different from the Bill? If that is, is the old fiscal note accurate?"

Davis: "Well, the fiscal note is no longer needed because it was determined that instead of the banks or the Public Aid having to take identify...to take pictures identification.

Drivers licenses are acceptable or any picture ID."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Churchill: "You made a reference, in your opening remarks, that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

you had discussed this issue with the bankers. Is that not the case?"

Davis: "Yes."

Churchill: "Did the bankers give you some sample language of an Amendment that they found acceptable?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Churchill: "And did you use that sample language that they gave you?"

Davis: "We used what they gave us yesterday."

Churchill: "But you did not use the language that they gave you, that they said would take care of their problems?"

Davis: "Well this, Sir, this Amendment is a compromise between the Department of Public Aid and the bankers. The...this includes the language of both groups. One of the problems initially was that the banks wanted to be able to provide their own identification cards. Therefore that's why one of the pieces...Amendments has been added or it has been added to the Amendment."

Churchill: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. The Lady indicates that this is a compromise. The word compromise means that all of the sides have come to some agreement and signed off on that agreement. That is not the case in this situation. The bankers do not agree with the language that the Lady is presenting in Amendment #4. They have different language which they've proposed, that language was not used, they have not signed off on this agreement. The Illinois Bankers Association is opposed to Amendment #4."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Amendment...they're not opposed to Amendment #4. We've agreed to continue to work with them as this Bill goes to the Senate. In reference to one small section that has to do with the Banking Licensure Code in reference to the Banking Code and Liability. And I just felt that I did not

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- want to change the Banking Code. Whatever the existing code is I wanted to leave the banking existing code as is. The intent for this legislation..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Okay, you can refer those remarks in your closing remarks. We have other people that want to either make a statement or ask a question. Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "To the Sponsor, this Bill mandates that banks and savings and loans cash Public Aid checks if certain identification is shown. What if I am an employee of Kraft's and I get my paycheck and I go into a bank, and I don't have an account, do they have a right to refuse to sign...to cash my paycheck under your Bill or under existing law?"
- Davis: "Well, this Amendment is referring to Public Aid recipients only it is not referring to kraft."
- Johnson: "So, at least under existing law as continued by your Bill, there's nothing to prohibit a bank from refusing to cash a Kraft paycheck or a union paycheck or a legislative paycheck. But they have to honor Public Aid checks. Is that correct?"
- Davis: "The banks can refuse to cash the Public Aid recipients check if they do not agree with or accept the identification that is presented."
- Johnson: "Stop. That isn't my question, Representative Davis.

 My question is, under existing law, as continued under
 your...your...your Bill. It only mandates that checks,
 Public Aid checks, have to be cashed and it doesn't mandate
 that current income checks have to cashed. Is that right?"
- Davis: "That's correct."
- Johnson: "I also note that legislation provides that one of the following valid forms of identification is sufficient: an identification card, drivers license, and so forth. Most

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

places, in order to cash a check, you have two forms of identification. This at least in the limited context of Public Aid recipients would change that normal requirement. Is that right? One is enough. Mandated that one be enough."

- Davis: "Well, this...that's not exactly correct, Representative Johnson. What this does say is that two pieces of ID are required and the bank can make a requirement of a third piece which will be a piece that they...it's...the third piece can be in substitution of the two other pieces. If the bank so desires. For example, you might have a bank check cashing card. And the bank would have the right to continue to issue that card to the recipients."
- Johnson: "I note that the legislation also requires that the

 Department of Public Aid issue an identification card to

 every Public Aid recipient. That isn't a current

 requirement?"
- Davis: "That is already part...that is already law, Sir. They already do that."
- Johnson: "Why does the analysis provide or the Bill provide that they have to do it then?"
- Davis: "I imagine they were just making that...It currently...it is currently the law that Public Aid recipients must have identification from the Department."
- Johnson: "I'm looking...I'm looking at page...Well, I note on page 3, lines 1 thru 4 of the Bill, 'Provide that the Illinois Department shall issue an ID card to every payee of a grant under this Code. The card shall be sent to the payee together with his or her first grant payment.' And that language is underlined which according to the Legislative Reference Bureau is new statutory material. So, apparently you are changing the law."

Davis: "What we're doing is we are stating that three pieces of

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

identification are needed. The banks wanted this in the legislation. One of those pieces is a photo ID: a drivers license, a state identification card. Currently public ID, I mean, Public Aid recipients must have ID to cash a check. So the only thing we're adding here is they can use this at the bank as one of their identifications...pieces of identifications. We're recognizing...we're recognizing the existing law."

Johnson: "That's not what the...that may be what your explanation, Representative Davis, but that's not what the says. I guess I...I'm simply reading the Bill. I also not that there's a requirement that the payee has to immediately report the theft or loss and so forth. to prevent, however, a recipient from bringing in a check, cashing it and then in the next moment having somebody in an attempt to defraud the institution? Reporting a or loss and having the check reissued? If you don't have a quick computer that could cause problems. To the Bill. this is a real infringement on any kind of semblance of a free enterprise system in this state. In addition to mandates which cost money, which costs the state money, costs the banks money, which ultimately costs recipients money. In addition to all those things it elevates Public Aid recipients to a hire status than anyone who works for living and receives an earned income а paycheck. It requires that those paychecks have signed or have...have to be cashed where the same requirement isn't imposed on someone who works for a factory or works for the state. It's not good business. It's costly. It's an imposition on the free enterprise system. And it's not good public policy for this state. I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Clerk. Do we have another Amendment filed on this Bill? Is there an Amendment #5? No, there is not. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Amendment, I was under the assumption that we had potentially five Amendments. Amendment #4 is language that would clarify, as far as the Department of Public Aid goes, the banks throughout the State of Illinois are opposed to Amendment #4. They were hoping that Amendment #5 would be put on to the Bill to which would take care of the problems that they had. Your sitting here and basically one state agency, you're sort of telling the banks that they have to cash the checks. It runs into a problem as far downstate also. The Sponsor said that the Department of Public Aid they do have photo ID cards. That is true but outside of Cook County Public Aid County recipients do not have to have, I repeat, do not have to have photo ID cards outside of Cook County. So, you get a Public Aid recipient who does not drive a car, outside of Cook County, having one heck of a problem. Now they go into the bank telling the bank the bank has to cash their which to me is an infringement on the free check, enterprise system, and they do not have photo ID cards. This Bill with the Amendments causes a lot of problems. would ask at the present time, defeat Amendment #4 and defeat the Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative, isn't it true that people, who do not have drivers licenses, can go to the Secretary of State's offices and get ID cards?"

Davis: "Yes, Representative, it...this Bill does not say there

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

has to be a photo ID. It does not say that. It says a valid ID."

Satterthwaite: "If the bank were to insist on a photo ID would not a Public Aid recipient go and get an ID card from the Secretary of State's Office that would have a picture on it?"

Davis: "That is correct."

Satterthwaite: "Well, it seems to me that even if downstate people do not have this ID automatically from Public Aid that, that is a very legitimate route, that we certainly need to find a way for our Public Aid recipients to be able to get their checks cashed as efficiently and as cheaply as It's also true that we are talking about state checks in this case. We're talking about their aid checks which is a state check. And, so it would seem to me that the bankers would not be very much at risk in accepting a state check for processing. I think that the Lady has made a good faith attempt to try to find a way of giving Public Aid people to get their money. And I would certainly expect that we should support this Amendment. If it needs additional work there is still the Senate opportunity for But it would seem to me that we are helping our Public Aid people to get their checks cashed efficiently and without a great deal of expense to them. And I would applaud the Lady's Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Lou Jones."

Jones, L: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of this legislation because, as it stands right now I feel that the State of Illinois is giving the person the money and turning around and charging them at the currency exchange for cashing the check. What the Lady has did in this Bill is make it much easier for the person to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

cash their check. The previous Speaker before me explained what would happen to a person downstate that does not have With the ID in Chicago they have to have the ID rather they cash their check at the bank or whether they their check at the currency exchange. The bank can ask for three pieces of ID if they want to. All this...all this legislation is doing is maybe putting four or five more dollars back into the person's purse. Let them keep it in their pocket book rather than you taking the check and turning around and charging them for cashing it. an 'aye' vote and I urge an 'ave' vote for this legislation."

- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's unfortunate that this Amendment has not been worked out and this issue has not been resolved. The Lady has identified a very real problem and I think it's too bad that this Amendment does not meet approval and has not been worked out. Because this is certainly a problem that should be worked out. And I'd urge defeat of the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Bill 4208. And I want to compliment the Sponsor on a sensible good idea. The currency exchanges currently have a monopoly on Public Aid recipients and they charge very exorbitant rates. Finally, everyone is protected because of the very extensive ID requirements. And I urge 118 votes in favor of this Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well, that was a very inspirational speech. The good

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

thing about this Amendment is that it makes a bad Bill a little worse and maybe then we could defeat the Bill. Certainly, the issue of being able to cash your Public Aid check is one that has merit. There is no doubt that these people should be allowed to cash checks. But to grant them special dispensation for no other reason than because it's a Public Aid check. This goes against everything that makes sense in not only financial circles but general common everyday business circles. It's just is ludicrous to me to take one segment of the population because they happen to have a government check, in this case we're choosing Public Aid recipients, it could State Representatives or government employees. And say that 'You have to cash that check.' If the bank wants to you have to have an account with them they ought to be able to have in the free marketplace that privilege. And that's all that the current law says. It's relatively reasonable and this Amendment just flies in the face of everything that makes sense in the financial circles. If it's adopted, and I've got a feeling it probably will then it will probably help kill House Bill 4208. the old saying says 'there's good news and bad news.'"

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is something with some appeal but I think we have to consider it in the larger context. Under our laws if the bank cashes a check on a forged endorsement it is responsible to the true owner of that check, period. It is the person that absorbs the loss. Public Aid doesn't absorb the loss. The forger doesn't absorb the loss unless the person can be caught. It is the bank that pays twice on a forged endorsement. So, to say that even with what you might consider adequate

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

identification, to expose the banks to that risk, just is not a fair thing to ask. The reason Public Aid has contracts with currency exchanges is because the contract recognizes the risk of paying on forged endorsements. That's why the current system is the way it is. That's why banks are not required under our law currently to cash checks. They don't have to cash my check. They don't have to cash your check. And it's not a question whether the check is good, that is whether the payor will honor the check, the question is, is the endorsement forged? It's the forged endorsement that exposes the bank...it's the forged endorsement which exposes the bank to liability. And that is what you ignore with this Amendment and indeed with this whole Bill. I oppose the Amendment. I oppose the Bill. Period."

Speaker Giglio: "Lady from St. Clair, Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think it's very important that this Amendment be added to this Bill because Banks are quasi-public entities which have been given a license to provide for the credit needs of their community. As of this time, particularly in East St. Louis for example image that it's true in Chicago, they are syste...systematically denying Public Aid recipients their right to access to credit needs, that is the ability to cash a check. In East St. Louis, the way this happens is they first of all require that the aid...recipients open up a banking account. They require that \$100 of a \$300 aid check be deposited to open an account this is so high as to deny access to banking. Secondly, because none of three banks in East St. Louis will cash the check, the aid recipient has to go to the currency exchange where mother is charged three and four dollars for a \$300 check.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

The other day I got a letter that said that for a \$35 state check this lady was charged three dollars. And I think that is a denial. And I think that is a usurplication (sic — usurpation). I think it is horrible that state funds are being siphoned off by such a ridiculous policy. And I think that we should not cooperate with that and the way we do not cooperate, with such usurious practices, is to allow and require that banks cash Aid to Dependent Mothers' checks. I think it's a horrendous situation."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, I'm truly regretful that this Amendment wasn't agreed to by everyone involved. And in particular because I know that the Illinois Bankers Association was more than willing, genuinely willing to work with the Sponsor and arrive at something that they could agree And I think they understood just as most of us do that what this amounts to is giving an increase, an annual and a monthly increase, to people on Public Aid. We have sat in this chamber on I don't know how many occasions and listened to all of our colleagues complain, because who are on Public Aid do not receive enough to really maintain a decent standard of living. If people don't have to spend, and in my area it is seven as much as seven dollars per check that is charged to these people, for getting their check cashed at a currency exchange. That's seven or eight dollars they don't have and for them seven or eight dollars is a lot of money. I would like to ask the Sponsor and I hope that she would respond to this. know that the Illinois Bankers Association would be than pleased to work with any Sponsor you may select for your Bill in the Senate to try to get this worked out. First of all, this is the same as giving an increase in the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

monthly benefits to Public Aid recipients because that's what the result really is and they need that. The second thing that it seems to me is really important is that this puts the banking community in the position of being a real partner with the state in helping these people. And I know they are willing to do that. So I would ask if I could have your commitment, your pledge that when this Bill goes to the Senate that Senate Sponsor will sit down with the Bankers Association and work this out. So that whatever is required as far as the identification and all of those things work out something that everyone can agree to because the concept is excellent. Would you agree to that?"

Davis: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "I couldn't hear you."

Davis: "I definitely will agree to that excellent suggestion, yes."

Cowlishaw: "Very good. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis: "Yes, thank you very much. I think Representative Cowlishaw has just about closed for me when she stated so eloquently that it is true welfare recipients are spending eight, nine, ten dollars to cash very small checks. And if we can put something into the law that will allow them to keep these extra dollars. It will certainly be beneficial I would very happily continue to work with the bankers. At this point we have worked very diligently with the staff on...and the Department of Public Aid. And the Department at this point is satisfied. We are not attempting to make the banks do anything that will be harmful to them. And I think this small point will certainly be taken care of. And Ι Representative Cowlishaw that any dollars that we can save

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

recipients helps to save the state money. It will help the banks in that they will be allowed to use some of the funds that they have in their...in their banks for the cashing of these checks. And we've talked with some of them in reference to that. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Roll Call. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Representative Bowman, one minute to explain your vote."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to point out that these Public Aid checks are absolutely secure. I mean no bank is going to lose money because the check bounced. The banks have absolutely nothing to fear by this Amendment. And it will be an increase for all intents and purposes to the real income of the welfare recipients. So that this is a perfect policy where everyone wins and no one loses. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Yes, I think I'd like to take this out of the record,
- Unknown: "You can't take it out of the record while there's a
 vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "After a Roll Call. Have all voted who wish?

 Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 45

 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. The Amendment fails.

 Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third...You want to leave the Bill on Second?

 Third Reading. Does the Lady want leave for immediate

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

consideration? Out οf the record, Mr. going to Representative Hicks. We're Transportation. Representative Hicks. Special Order of Transportation. Second Reading. Representative Hicks, you have 4172. Do you want to hear that Bill? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Alright, House Bills, Transportation. Third Reading. Representative Lang - LeFlore - Santiago. Representative Lang? Out of the record. Representative LeFlore, House Bill 2899. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2899, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to public conveyance transportation drivers. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2899 creates the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act to require applicants for bus drivers' positions with private companies and with the Authority authorize a crimi...blue print check and also it allows the applicants' name and sex and date of birth and social security number. And the Department of State Police who shall change the private companies fees...charge the private companies fees...investigations the company charges to the...further investigation shall be incurred by the company. And the question was raised, when the Bill was brought...when the Amendment was put on, what would be the cost? The cost of the criminal background check; the state portion would be \$10, the federal portion would be \$20which is a total of \$30. And the unit cost of drug testing for the CTA will be \$10.12 and if there's a need for a second test it'll be \$50. For Metro the first test will be \$29 and the second test would be \$21. Now those are charges for the drug testing."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, when you mentioned those costs I didn't understand who was to pay those costs."

LeFlore: "The private bus companies will pay the cost, Representative."

Ropp: "The bus company will take care of the cost of the test and...so in other words they won't reduce or charge the driver for the test which would reduce his income?"

LeFlore: "Your right."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2899 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 2899 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3043, Representative Santiago. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3043, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

House Bill 3043 it's...the Bill will amend the Vehicle

Code. It requires each school bus driver applicant to

submit to a national finger print check. This is a Bill

that...it's a compromise Bill between the IEA, the State

Police. The Bill has been supported by all the original

superintendents. It also has support of many other

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

organizations. The bus drivers, contractors also are in support of the Bill. I ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, excuse me, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

Hartke: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Weller."

Weller: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Weller: "Representative Santiago, you indicated that the Illinois

Educational Association is now supporting the Bill?"

Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

Weller: "Okay. So the language is agreed?"

Santiago: "Yes."

Weller: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a quick question."

Santiago: "Yes."

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Bill signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, Representative Homer 'aye'. Mr. Clerk,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

take the record. On this question, 114 voting 'yes', voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill 3043 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Rice, 'aye'. Let the record indicate Representative Rice has voted 'aye' Bill. the previous On the Order οf Children, Representative Preston, Representative Currie, Representative Trotter. House Bills, Second Reading, On the Order of Children, 3708, Representative Preston. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3708, a Bill for an Act to license child care workers. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration by the Attendance Roll Call.

Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

The Bill is on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3708, a Bill for an Act to amend the licensed child care workers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3708 applies only to private residential treatment in group homes that are licensed by the State of Illinois. And it will...the Bill creates minimal training standards for workers with these...this difficult population of children who are the residents of these homes. Requires 60 hours of training as a minimum and this is a major child protection issue. What this Bill does not apply to, it does not apply to child care workers in state or county operated centers or state or county institutions

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

and group homes, it does not apply to boarding schools, it does not apply to day care centers. But it will protect children in private non-profit residential treatment centers and group homes. And it specifies basic competence and moral character of child care workers, it establishes criteria for child care workers including: age, training and a written examination. It provides a mechanism for the payment of an application and renewal fees. It will create a Child Care Worker Licensure Board to serve in an advisory capacity. I would be glad to answer any questions and I'd urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. The Department of Professional Regulation opposes this Bill. They oppose it among other reasons because this regulation will tend to phase out of existence this very person which it seeks to professionalize, suppose. It's another case, in my opinion and in the Department's opinion, of over regulation. Ιt really relates to the type of institution and not the person involved. It sets forth standards and a \$75 licensure fee which is a big dent in these persons income. Alot of them are earning minimum wage. I don't believe there's been a demonstration of a problem sufficient to warrant licensure of this type of activity. It's going to cost some money for the Department to start it up. It goes into effect January 1, 1991, which is to soon for the Department to be And it, really, will have the effect, I set up for. believe, of tending to depress interest in this area. You know, as soon as you start to regulate you start to stifle competition. Now maybe that's not the right phrase to when you're talking about licensure of child care workers but, in fact, there is something akin to that in this type

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

of activity. It cannot be so burdensome that the efforts necessary to get into the activity outweigh whatever benefits there are and, frankly, that is what this Bill will do. It definitely...its burdens will outweigh its benefits dramatically, it will send up the cost of these care facilities and activities. It's just an entirely inappropriate area to get into so comprehensively. The Department has looked at this carefully. They oppose it on grounds of not only administration but also on the merits. And I rise in opposition."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. It is my understanding that there are about 32 groups that now wish to be licensed by the Department of Professional Regulation. And, so it's very difficult to single out any one of these groups. I'm sure that all 30 some feel that they certainly are worthy. On no other argument, we simply can't be accepting every group that wants to come in and be licensed. And, in this particular case, it seems irresponsible to put the Department of Professional Regulation in the child care business. If it belongs anywhere it probably belongs in DCFS, that is also overburdened already. So, I do stand in opposition to this piece of legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Weller."

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Weller: "Representative, it's my understanding that House Bill 3708 only applies to those individuals who work in private non-profit residential treatment centers and group homes.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

My church, First Christian Church of Morris, operates a preschool staffed solely by volunteers. Say my wife would like to volunteer at the preschool. Would she be prohibited to do this under your legislation?"

Preston: "I'm sorry to disappoint you, Representative. But no she would not this has no application whatsoever to day care facilities. This has application solely to residential treatment facilities. This Bill 3708 deals only with the most disturbed children in our society who require very specialized type of residential care and no other."

Weller: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Thank you. Representative, can you tell me on what page...you've made reference to licensed residential treatment facility. I've looked through the Bill hurriedly and I can't find that."

Preston: "Well, Representative the Bill is some 16 pages in length."

Black: "I know, that's why I asked you I thought maybe you knew where it was."

Preston: "Yeah. No, it would take me some time to point that out but I could direct you to our Democratic analysis...which...where they've had more time to look at it and that's what the analysis indicates and that's the intent."

Black: "I have no doubt that your intent is certainly honorable...I...In the definition of the Bill, line 16, where you've given the definitions on page one. It just doesn't come out very apparent...you know, in the apparent sense as to what you're doing. I think there is some confusion as to who is licensed and who will be regulated

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

by the Act. I think previous Speakers have pointed out of the concerns, the high turnover the...obviously you wouldn't go into this line of work you were expecting to be renumerated at a...for a large some of money. And the licensing aspect itself could somewhat expensive. I...I...I don't know. everything is as you purport it to be but I know downstate it just simply...we have all kinds of problems trying to get people to work in such institutions and areas now. I don't see where this will help. So, I would rise in reluctant opposition to your measure. I'm sorry, one further question. It does preempt home rule, does it not?" Preston: "Yes, it does. And in answer to your previous question, on page 2 of the Bill, Section 4, it discusses under Eligibility as to reference to who this applies to 'any person employed on the effective date of this Act child care worker, a licensed child care facility as defined by the Child Care Act of 1969 which provides the residential treatment in group home services.' Those are the people who this Bill applies to and not people in day

Black: "So, it doesn't then...it...it isn't your intent that this get into the ABC Nursery, The First Presbyterian Day Care Center..."

Preston: "Absolutely not, only residential treatment centers for the most disturbed children that we have."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative."

care or other kinds of institutions."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hultgren"

Hultgren: "Time. It's time for dinner."

Speaker Giglio: "But it's not here. Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief question for the Sponsor because I think one of the persons who might have been interested in this Bill, and you can refresh my

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

memory, wasn't in committee at the time and doesn't seem to be around now. Is the Illinois Association for the Education of Young Children, represented by 'Alana Hostedler', in favor or opposed to this legislation? Do you can you remember?"

Preston: "I...I'm sorry, Representative. I can't recall...I can't answer that."

Curran: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from...Excuse me. The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair, please."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Cowlishaw: "This Bill preempts home rule that is clearly stated not only in the Bill but in the synopsis on the front of the Bill. Because it preempts home rule could you please tell me how many votes are required for passage?"

Speaker Giglio: "The Parliamentarian informs the Chair it takes 60 votes."

Cowlishaw: "I thought so, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Anthony Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Young, A.: "I know you've answered this question before but I'm still confused as to actually who this Bill would apply to and who it would not apply to."

Preston: "Okay. This Bill applies solely to residents in non...not-for-profit residential care facilities and group homes. It has no application to day care facilities, to...other than non-residential and group home treatment facilities."

Young, A.: "Can you tell me where in the Bill that's..."

Preston: "Section 4, page 2 of the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Young, A.: "When I look at the Bill and see who's excluded, it sounds like when you say non-profit that if somebody has a residential group home facility that's for profit that this Bill would not apply to them. Is that correct?"
- Preston: "Well, you know, I don't want to mislead you that is my understanding but in reading page 2 of it...I frankly I'm not aware of any for profit residential care facilities like this...I suppose the simple answer to your question is, I am not absolutely certain. I know it does not apply to county and...it applies to no public facilities only to private facilities. And I believe the only private facilities are not-for-profit private facilities that provide residential treatment for children in need of residential care."
- Young, A.: "So, you're telling me that the residential day care facility in my area, this does not apply to that."
- Preston: "Well, no, if you're saying day care that's not residential. If this is for somebody who stays overnight in a facility and the children who are those residents are children who have serious drug addiction problems, psychiatric problems, physical and mental handicaps and are in need of that residential type care."
- Young, A.: "There're criminal penalties in the Bill. Do they apply to the employee, to the actual person who may work without these requirements? Or who? Who do they apply to?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Bring your remarks to a close."
- Preston: "The penalties under the Bill apply to the home that does not have licensed...who is required to have licensed employees to care for these children who are in need of this residential care and who fail to have those employees caring for these children be licensed under the purview of the Act."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Young, A.: "And finally there's a requirement for a high school degree for everyone. What about people who are currently working in the profession that may not have a high school degree? Does this grandfather anybody in?"
- Preston: "Representative, the people who care for these children who are severely disturbed, highly troubled juveniles need some type of minimum..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Proceed, one minute to conclude."
- Preston: "I'm answering a question, Mr. Speaker. I'm responding to a question."
- Speaker Giglio: "Well, you know, we're getting into a dialogue here and we've got ten other people that want to speak.

 Bring your remarks to a close."
- Young, A.: "Let me ask one more question, Representative. I'm sorry but I know the department is opposed to it and the Department of Regulation is opposed to it. Who's the supporter of this Bill? Where did it come from?"
- Preston: "The supporter of the Bill is the Child Care Association of Illinois, is one, a number of child care organizations are in favor of this Bill to provide minimal standards for licensing the workers at the child care facilities."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston to close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3708 has gotten bogged down in some controversy which frankly I don't understand. We have some children in the State of Illinois who are the most needy in terms of care. Think of the condition of a child that has to be placed in a residential care facility where 24 hour a day care is needed for that child. This Bill for the workers who do that care prescribes a certain minimal standards of licensure, some minimal training, some 60 hours of training, to include CPR training, to include some minimal child care type training. It provides for a minimal high

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

school diploma as the minimal education that is needed to care for these highly troubled, highly needy youngsters. This Bill is reasonable. The Child Care Association of Illinois and others are proponents of this legislation. They think it's necessary to provide the highest and best care for children who are most in need of care. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3708 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 30 voting 'aye', 64 voting 'no' and 14 voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. House Bill 3771. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3771..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin. 3771."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the State Agency
Employees Child Care Services Act. Third...Second Reading
of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Does the Lady have leave?

Representative McGann, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

McGann: "My switch did not go on on 3708. I would have recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 3708."

Speaker Giglio: "Let the record so indicate, Mr. Clerk,
Representative McGann's request. Representative
DeJaeqher."

DeJaegher: "Yes, inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

DeJaegher: "There was a commitment made by you that supper would be served at approximately 7:00 o'clock. It is now 7:10 and supper has not been served as yet. I always enjoy prompt suppers. Would you see that something could be done about this."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative DeJaegher, the food is outside, if you'd care to go out and help the pages bring it in, you can have it in two minutes. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Third Reading. House Bill 3771, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3771, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3771, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Agencies Employee's Child Care Services Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin." Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill deals with the availability of child care services for state employees, in the State of Illinois. The Governor's 1987 task force on day care indicated that the state should develop and implement a plan to expand child opportunities for all state employees, and that it should assume a leadership role in providing child care services. That task force report, developed in 1987, unfortunately has not been implemented to any extent in Illinois at this This Bill attempts to implement it, by requiring that state agencies that employee fifty children or...that employ fifty employees or more, and are either refurbishing an old building or building a complete new building take into consideration those child care needs and provide them. Despite the example of child care services that have been...has been available at the Willard Ice Revenue Building that is the only facility to date that has provided needed services in spite of the fact that the state library, the state police building, the Harris I, and the Harris II Public Aid building and Bressmers building

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

downtown has been refurbished by the State of Illinois with attention to this issue whatsoever. Gentlemen, it is, I think, this Bill passed out committee unanimously and I think it's the intent of the Members to send a strong message to this state government issue addressed, we have been working that we want this through CMS, and through the Capital Development Board to try to work through the appropriate agencies to get it done and without any success. So, we would like to send a clear message that this is a pressing state need and we ought to be addressing it. I ask for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

"Thank you. I rise in opposition to this and it isn't McCracken: because the intent of this Bill is bad. However, it frankly does not take into account enough οf complexities which confront any decision on this issue. This amounts to state subsidized daycare for employees. is not done through the collective bargaining process, done in the course of negotiations between is not management and labor, rather it is mandated by us requires provision of a room in all new buildings, even if they are newly leased rather than owned, and requires the provision of the services. What it fails to take into account is all the variations that enter into a parent's decision on whether and where to engage daycare services. They may not want to use the state provided service, but the state to offer it anyway. There may be plenty of daycare in the area, there may not be a shortage of daycare centers in the area, none of that is taken into account. Right conducts studies when it gets into new buildings to determine whether daycare should be offered and definitely the wrong way to go. It's absolutely inflexible

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

if you want to send a message to the Governor, let's send a responsible message. Not something written in concrete and inflexible regardless of the situation at each particular location."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

- Deuchler: "Representative Breslin, can you give us some facts or figures on the waiting list situation in, as regarded to the Willard Ice Building."
- Breslin: "Yes, the waiting list at the Willard Ice Building is that they have 200 children waiting on the list and it is assumed that many of those children could never...will wait so long that they will be too old to even be admitted. And this facility is, they assume that by the end of this year, the facility will be completely occupied only by Revenue employee children, and still have a 200 children waiting."
- Deuchler: "As I recall, wasn't there a survey of CMS employees or state employees in Sangamon county that came up with requests for around a thousand daycare slots."
- Breslin: "Yes, in addition to that, the League of Women Voters has done a survey of the Springfield area, and found pressing child care needs, particularly around the capitol complex."
- Deuchler: "In support of the Bill, Representative Breslin, I think many of us have followed the issue of daycare, we certainly are appreciative of the working parents, two income families, people...single parents who need these daycare services and I'm strongly in support of your legislation."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Leverenz: "Could you give us, I guess a thumbnail sketch of what the law is currently."

Breslin: "The current law requires that in the construction of any new building...no, the current law is that there should be a survey of all state employees to determine what the child care needs are for any particular facility...agency by agency. There is no requirement that the state address those needs, if this Bill passed they would still have to do the survey to determine what the need is. But if the need is there then they are going to have to build in the services for new buildings."

Leverenz: "I understood that if there was a substantial need that they would do it, provide some sort of daycare setting, and that isn't correct?"

Breslin: "It is not mandated that they provide it even though the survev shows that i+ is necessary. It was our understanding when we worked with CMS on that legislation years ago, that they would certainly try to do that. It just hasn't happened, that's why I have pointed out examples where new buildings have been built and they have not followed through with incorporating daycare services where they were needed. And these are daycare services that the employees pay for, this is not a subsidy previously been referred to. We are just indicating that the space has to be provided and then the employees have to pay the cost."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker to the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "And the Bill as amended. I think it's high time that

we take the Governor's statement that this is an important

thing to do and the Department of Central Management

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Services and the Capitol Development Board that says this is an important thing to do, and if they will not then do it on their own we must put it into the law and I would ask that everyone would vote 'aye'. It's about time that we take care of our own that work for state government as well as support these types of services that are outside of state government. I solicit your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have met with the Governor I think on at least four occasions, maybe five, over the past few years and we've had the director of CMS and the director of CDB legislative liaisons and we've had many many promises. They've taken surveys and that's all we've gotten I think that we ought to be very proud of the promises. parents, there are a lot of single parents out there, both men and women that have custody of their children that want them at work where they can go at lunch time and have lunch with their children, it's a bonding that is necessary. It is easier to pay at one end of the spectrum than it is at the other end of the spectrum. We get up and we talk about latch key kids, and the needs of children, this is starting the bottom rung where it's very, very important for the parents to be with the children, the interest, the bonding and let those little kids know that their parents really want them and they want them near them. We've had nothing but promises. One of the former speakers says he doesn't think this is the way to go. I think we've waited long enough it's been bipartisan, we've had Members on the Democratic side and the Republican side attend all these meetings. I would suggest a very strong 'aye' vote on behalf of children."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill,
what better example can we send to business and to people
whom we are trying to encourage to provide daycare for
their own employees than for us to do the same. I think it
is the responsibility of the government to take the lead on
issues which are important to the citizens of our state.
This is the way that we can do that. It seem ludicrous for
us to be encouraging business to get into the daycare
business for it's employees when we're so hesitant to do so
ourselves. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen, B.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Pedersen, B.: "We are told that there are a lot of needy people out there who need daycare, you know, single parents and all that. I mean is there anything in what the state's doing in the legislation here that really targets the needy people or is any employee eligible, can any employee no matter how much they make get on the waiting list?"

Breslin: "The one facility that we have in the State of Illinois is at the Willard Ice Building. In that building the cost is born by the employees but there is a sliding fee scale. So that the neediest people have it at a far lower cost. I am assuming that since that facility has been so successful that that will be the model for any other facility in the state."

Pedersen, B.: "So what you're really is that even people who can afford to pay, you know say private sector daycare fees, are eligible...are able to get this daycare."

Breslin: "Representative Pedersen, this is not an issue of being able to afford child care, it's an issue of being able to find available child care, that is quality, these

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

facilities...the Willard Ice Facility is not a cheap facility, it is a high cost facility and the parents are willing to pay for it, the point is, it's paid for by the parents, but space is made available close to the employees work sight, that is the whole object of the Governors task force. We're suppose to be leaders in this issue and instead, we are dragging our feet."

- Pedersen, B.: "But what I'm trying to determine is whether or not we have wealthy people who are participating in these programs."
- Breslin: "I have no idea if they are wealthy, I do know if they are participating they have children and they need quality care for them and they are paying for it."
- Pedersen, B.: "So it does...so it really doesn't matter how much they're making, is that what you're telling me?"
- Breslin: "That's correct, it's a first come, first serve proposal."
- Pedersen, B.: "Okay...alright, good, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. You know we have all this carrying on about daycare at the national level, the ABC types they want to create a big bureaucracy, and subsidize centers. You know, we're talking centers. And there is a very small percentage of the public that really wants centers. They have all these other ways of doing it, there is neighborhood family. on, we've heard all those things. What we're talking about here is an effort at the state level to do the thing, they're trying to do at the national level. We have private sector out there who offer these facilities. wonder what the private sector feels about this unfair competition. We...we had a group on the Republican side, who really talked to the state about what their system was and the truth is there is really a heavy subsidy there, there are no capitol costs and that's what your talking

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

about here, no capitol costs. No mortgage payments, no tax payments, and so what we're really talking about undermining any private effort. But the problem with all of this is that we have certain groups in this country have determined that it's very important that we have daycare centers and that we have a lot of people who don't use daycare centers because mothers choose to stay home and many of them are really not wealthy at all, because they feel that's the best thing. So what happens is that we end up that those people are discriminated against and they're forced to subsidize people who often are making more money. It seems to me the real approach to establish the priorities is let's reduce taxation on families. Let's make major reductions at the federal and state level to reduce taxation on families especially if they have little kids. And then we'll see what the problem really is. think a lot of those so called, needs, will disappear because they would prefer to stay home. So I think this is a move in the wrong direction. It creates an...where wherever you go, you go if there is a subsidy you're going to have waiting lists and that's why you've got them. I also understand the Governor really is not for this Bill. So I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Cullerton in the Chair. We've just discovered this Bill is on Short Debate, so I'd like to ask Representative Breslin to close and then if you want to explain your vote you'll have one minute to do so. Representative Breslin to close."

Breslin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentleman. I would say that the debate has been full, I thank Representative Barnes, Deuchler, and Hasara, for your support. I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3771

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Representative Curran, one minute to explain your vote."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has nothing to do with big government or how much money you make or whether we want more of a bureaucracy. This simply has to do with being close to your kids, like all of us would like to be right now, at this time of this day. Close to your children, to help your children, and I know we don't need this speech to gather more votes so I'll just stop. But it's about being close to your children so that you can take care of your kids and give them the kind of family relationship during the day that you're able to give them on the evenings and weekends."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative John Dunn, one minute to explain your vote."

Dunn: "I think it's nice that state employees can be close to their children, but the people who pay the taxes which enable the state employees to be close to their children should also have the option to be close to their children. This does nothing for private workers and private industry and it's unfair to single out state employees at a disadvantage to the people who pay the taxes to make that program possible. This is a bad concept and should not be adopted into law unless everybody can be treated equally. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative McNamara, one minute to explain your vote."

McNamara: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very important issue, there are already private companies that provide daycare for their employees. And as a result they get better employees. The State of Illinois should have been the leader in this instead of the follower, I think it's

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

absolutely correct to provide those facilities. And also to provide those benefits for the workers that serve the people."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 95 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and House Bill 3771 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Children, Third Reading. Representative Currie, House Bill 1268.

 Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to domestic violence shelters. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. amended. the Bill deals with the apparent attack and essentially, it has two provisions. One, the first is that should a blood test be 99.8...8 percent certain that a particular individual is the father of a given child then the presumption of paternity would switch. It would become a presumption rebuttable by clear and convincing evidence at that level of blood test result. Secondly, the Bill would provide that evidence from blood experts may be introduced by affidavit, subject to a...the opportunity on the part of the defendant or the plaintiff to have the right to bring the expert witness to court. The point here is to make sure the parentage actions move more quickly, but still support due process rights. A variety of states have gone in this direction. I would appreciate your support and would be happy to answer your questions."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 1268. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from
 Dupage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you. Is there someone in particular who

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

brought this proposal to your attention?"

Currie: "This was suggested by the Illinois Council on Women...Citizen's Council on Women, a bipartisan arm of this General Assembly. We work with..."

McCracken: "But not gender balanced, I'll bet."

Currie: "Oh, I would hope it would be."

McCracken: "It isn't, is it?"

Currie: "Well, I think that what happens, Representative, is that individuals request appointment and we, I believe, have at least one male..."

McCracken: "You haven't recruited any equally qualified men for the positions?"

Currie: "Representative McCracken, would you like to join? I bet...I bet Representative Daniels would...for you to be appointed. I would be so pleased to have to have you aboard."

McCracken: "I'm not volunteering. The question is...who have you recruited? Okay. To the Bill. I'm sure this is fine. I assume 500 - 1 is agreed by the medical community to be...certain to a reasonable medical standard, is that correct?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie?"

Currie: "Absolutely. And in fact the other states that have done this have gone to a much lower level than this Bill proposes for Illinois."

McCracken: "Do you promise you'll never come back seeking a lower level if we pass this Bill?"

Currie: "I don't promise that."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1268 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye',. Those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please, take the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. House Bill 1268 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Preston, House Bill 3577. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3577, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the protection and advocacy of children. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Preston."

"Thank you, Mr....Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3577 authorizes Governor to designate a private nonprofit corporation as the agency to provide protection and advocacy services the rights of children, who are wards of the state, children in foster care. The agency must be an independent...independent of any agency which provides services or guardianship to children and the designation is renewable every four years. I want to point out that legislation is based on existing law, it's permissive. It authorizes the Governor to do this, does not require the Governor to do it. And it follows the model of the Protection and Advocacy Inc., that is an agency designated under federal law to perform the protection and advocacy duties on behalf of mentally ill and developmentally disabled individuals. This agency under this legislation will receive no state funds. It is funded only by federal and private sources. There is no cost to the state. authorizes, does not require the Governor to do this. has worked very well for the mentally ill developmentally disadvantaged individual, and I will also work very well for children who are now in foster care as wards of the state. I solicit your 'aye' vote and be glad to answer any questions."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
Bill 3577. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from
Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Can the state do this now, without a law being passed?"

Preston: "Not...no, Representative, not in terms of giving this agency access to records which are confidential and giving them the ability to receive federal and private funds."

Leverenz: "Is this on Short Debate?"

Speaker Cullerton: "No. It's not, Representative."

Preston: "No. It is not."

Leverenz: "Will this Bill ever see the light of day from Senate Rules Committee?"

Preston: "I certainly hope it will, Representative. Thank you for your concern. I hope so."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Preston: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to commend the Sponsor for mending the Bill as we discussed the other day and making this Bill permissive. In every form correct. Thank you, Representative. Thank you."

Preston: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr....Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. It is true. It is permissive. There is no money on it at this point, which to me makes it, totally unnecessary. Certainly if the Governor wishes to do so he can do so without this legislation, and it just seems silly to create another bureaucracy that we don't

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

have money for. There are no federal funds for, and so I think we should defeat this Bill now."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the floor. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Regan: "The confidentiality of the situation. What records would be opened up to this advocacy group?"

Preston: "Well, it...the kind of records that would be necessary
to oversee the placement of children in foster care and to
see what kind of problems may exist in foster care. Right
now you can't go and find out everything about the medical
records, placement history without authorization by law.
This gives this agency authorization of law."

Regan: "This has nothing to do then with the records of children who have been sexually abused, or..."

Preston: "Well, only in terms of children who are placed in foster care. It's not...the purpose of this and in fact the wording of this does not allow somebody to go into the whole background. That's not the purpose. The purpose is to find out whether proper permanency planning is taking place for children who have been made a ward of the state."

Regan: "To the Bill. I would suspect that this is opening up the records of DCFS to a group of people that may not want this...the...it wouldn't be a very good idea for them to have information. I feel that there's enough leaks. And I thought that maybe the person that would be going after would be a Mr. Murphy from Chicago. I think the DCFS has a responsibility to keep these records confidential. These children have gone through some torment. They gotten some abuse. And I think that they would be very embarrassed to have that made public. So, I've got to raise, which I

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

don't like to do, but I've got to raise in opposition to
this."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Preston to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is badly needed. We held hearing around the state on the problems that exist in foster care. those problems that were repeated brought to light at each of the hearings that we held was the problem of not having an adequate spokesman for children who have been placed in foster care, who can speak on their behalf...try to resolve on their behalf problems that exist in the foster care We've had children subject to foster care drift, system. going from one foster care placement to another, time time again without DCFS sitting back and looking at placement or permanency planning for these permanency Some...there's supposed to be a review in DCFS every eighteen months. There is supposed to be six month Child after child goes through the...the foster reviews. care system without these reviews. We need an advocate to speak for these children. They have no one else. relying on the people in this room to speak on their behalf. I hope you'll do it with your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3577 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final passage. Representative Wennlund, one minute to explain your vote. Representative Wennlund, you have one minute to explain your vote, now you have fifty seconds."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Leverenz correctly point out to me that this allows non-state and governmental agencies access to confidential state information. The Department of Children and Family Services, which gathers information on

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

adoptions, that information would be available on friends and family to non-governmental agencies, its a violation of the right to privacy and it should be defeated."

Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please, take the record. On this question there are 44 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And House Bill 3577 having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed...Represent...failed, I'm sorry. Representative Trotter, House Bill 3579. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3579, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Members of for the past few months for many meetings...through many meetings, through many hours, we're met with parents...for the foster parent children, we've met with the agencies, we've met with the people from the Department of Children and Family Services. And out of those meetings what we've come up with are several recommendations, one which was the last that you heard from our last...Sponsor of the Bill, and this is another. This Bill 3579 gives the Department the ability to implement and to administer a program of reimbursement to the foster parents. And those are for damages that are done by the children, either malicious, or intentional, or through neglect. Also, in this Bill we're addressing the concerns, which gives the Department the authority to set coverage for those reimbursement standards also. Additionally, what we do is we also amended the Insurance Code, which was suggested by the Department of Children and Family Services to avoid current practices that change false...charge faults to parents at a higher rate than they do people with

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

their normal home and renters insurance. These are concerns that are effecting the system in its whole. The system at this point in time by general consensus is falling apart. These concerns have addressed today in this Legislature can keep those parents within the system, can allow them to do their job as concerned individuals. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 3579, is there any discussion? Gentleman from DuPage,
 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "The Bill is permissive now. It allows DCFS to make these payments or reimbursements in its discretion. But that's already something it's authorized to do. So what this Bill really does is prohibit insurance companies from offering different rates of insurance based upon the presence in the home of a foster child. Now, I don't know if there are such differentials, do you know if there are? I mean, I don't know."
- Trotter: "Yes. I understand that there are. Out of these meetings we met with foster parents, and they had expressed that there has been these...these discrepancies, in which they are being given insurance rates. They are being billed and charged at business levels, versus as a home owner. We would like for this to be rectified and this Bill would do that."
- McCracken: "Okay. I just wonder if...and I don't know this answer either...if their differing rates are based on experience or not?"
- Trotter: "On experience? Yes. These were actually foster parents..."
- McCracken: "No. No. No. I don't mean them. I mean the insurance company rates...Are the insurance company differentials based on experience? Is there a correlation

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

between the presence of a foster child and the increase risk to the insurance company?"

- Trotter: "Oh, the insurance company...yes...I was under the impression as because of the presence of the foster child that they were given as a business. That they were looking as something that they were doing to make money versus for them someone who is doing a service for the state."
- McCracken: "Alright. I will defer to people who know the industry better than I, but what this Bill does is require that an insurance company not charge...differing rates. I don't know if that's good policy or not. I defer to the experts."

Trotter: "gouge..."

- Speaker Cullerton: "I'd like to make an announcement. In the Speaker's Conference Room there is pizza and chicken available, so if we can slowly take our turns to go back and get the food and when you're through with it there are dispensers on the side, so you don't have to put...throw the waste under your desk or leave it on your desk. Further discussion, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members in the House, I rise in opposition, I'm sorry to say. Because insurance companies I've investigated really don't do this. They will as a dependent, a foster child. Their liability part of the package covers everyone in the household including foster children. I have never seen any evidence to the opposite and I don't think that this Bill is if it is required, I'll do something required. However, about it. I'll make sure the insurance companies cover everybody as a dependent children. But it just doesn't happen, and I don't know, where Representative Trotter got his information from. Thank you."

119th Legislative Day

"Yes.

Trotter:

May 17, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Alright. To clarify my announcement, as you can see there are people passing out chicken, there's pizza in the conference room. So, if you asked for pizza don't take the chicken, you can get that in the Speaker's Conference Room. Representative Trotter, would you wish to close?"

First. I would like to answer Representative

Regan's concerns. I got the information from the parents themselves and also from the agency people, who gave us that information And T appreciate your commitment to make sure that this wouldn't happen. But law will insure that would have never happened again. That's what we are trying to present here in legislation. To close. To the Bill. As the agency is not aggressively opposed to this Bill, we have sat down in good faith and have worked with the agency and crafted the language that they felt would be good enough for them, that they could support. What's happening on the other side of the aisle, I don't know, but let's do something for the children, and not only for our own self aggrandizement this point in time. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call." Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage House Bill 3579. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. you're voting...I think they are passing out some of the So, don't take both. Have all voted who wish? pizza, too. Representative Wait...one minute to explain your vote. I'm sorry, Representative Wait can take both, but nobody else can take both pizza and chicken. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 100 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 3579 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- Trotter, House Bill 3581. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3581, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning family preservation services. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Trotter."
- Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin I wish to thank everyone for that last Roll Call. This Bill equally as important. It is also piece of the legislation that was brought out of those hearings that we had with the parents and with the agencies and with the department. What it does is, it provides moving...reasonable moving expenses or short-term rental costs, including month's rent and security deposit under its current program can be administered by the Department of Children and Family Services. It also extends that the current limit of assistance under the emergency assistance funds be included to \$500 cash, plus rental assistance. Additionally, what it asks for is that they can also submit in-kind contributions. in addition to the funds and for the rent. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House
 Bill 3581, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from
 Cook, Representative Martinez."
- Martinez: "Yes. I would have voted 'yes' on the previous Bill of Representative Trotter's. I don't recall the name...thank you."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Alright. On House Bill 3579, Representative Martinez indicated that he would have voted 'yes'. Any discussion on this Bill? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I commend the Gentleman for making House Bill

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

3581 now in a permissive vein rather than a mandatory vein. But I must reluctantly, Representative, rise to oppose your You know, what we're doing here is we're setting a precedent for getting the Department of Children and Family Services deeply involved in the real estate business and the public assistance business. And I...I'm not sure that that's what they were created to do. Now, I don't that we should set the precedent. I think we really have to examine...we read every day in the paper, and I know we get frustrated with the agency, but we've overburdened DCFS so many mandates, then we get mad at them when they don't do what we want them to do in a very timely fashion. just simply putting another...another service on them that we want them to do, or would ask them to do. not sure they have the resources, the time, the staff, While money to do it. it may be a good idea, and I commend the Representative for attempting it, and at least trying to make it permissive. I just don't think that they can take this burden on. Let's let DCFS to the job they were created to do. Let's get that all straightened out, then maybe we can move to other things. Representative, I reluctantly ask for a 'no' vote on your Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Will,
Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I hate to rise again in regards to anything that is...is my microphone on?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Your mike is on."

Regan: "The Department of Children and Family Services are responsible for children from zero to twenty-one years old.

Every aspect of child abuse. Every aspect of drugs. Every aspect of runaways. Every aspect of anything that has to do with the problem with children. Their department is

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

just absolutely overwhelmed. Eighty percent more calls on the hot line, fifty percent of those are false. But they still have to send out someone to investigate. If we don't quadruple their budget, they're going to have a difficult time handling just exactly what they have to do today. Representative, I know what you're trying to do, but let's keep the housing out of DCFS and let's let them concentrate on children."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Trotter to close."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Sir. Part of the mission of the Department of Children and Family Services is to keep the family together, and reunification...reunification of those families. This is done by giving them and assisting them in getting housing. One of the major components in separating families that do not have enough money in cases child abuse and child neglect for them to alternative housing. This Bill enables that family to stay together without being separated because of the monetary cost. This Bill is important. It's not putting them in the housing market, as has been insinuated by some, but what it does is, it helps them fulfill their mission to the children. This is why they were put together and became the Department of Children and Family Services in the first We have made this language permissive. We might work and make it harder next time, but right now that's not the concern. The concern as always is...and should be, especially with the Department of Children and Family Services, the children. I ask for a favorable Roll

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has asked for the passage of House Bill 3581. Is there any? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3581 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please, take the record. On this question there are 50 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. You want a Poll of the Absentees, Representative?"
- Trotter: "No. If I could put it on Postponed Consideration, possibly people will be more considerate after they finish eating."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Now we're going to go to the Order of Criminal Law Second Reading. Representative Homer, House Bill 2399. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2399, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Homer."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer, Amendment #1."
- Homer: "I would...I ask...to withdraw Amendments #1."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Petka."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Petka, Amendment #2."
- Petka: "I ask to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Cullerton: "#2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Petka."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Petka, Amendment #3.

 Representative Petka, when he finishes with his pizza will indicate whether...you want to withdraw it? Yes"
- Petka: "Yes."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Any further Amendments?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer, Amendment #4. Withdraw
Amendment #4? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer, Amendment #5."

Homer: "Withdraw, please."

Speaker Cullerton: "Okay. We're moving right along. Any other Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Petka."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Petka."

Petka: "Please withdraw that, please."

Speaker Cullerton: "Withdraw Amendment #6."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Homer and Weller."

Homer: :Representative Homer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me first of all say that the board is incorrect in that House Bill 2399 used to be my Bill, it is now Representative Flinn's Bill, my Amendment. However, I would like to start off by...this is the first Bill of the so called Drug Task Force. I want to commend all of the Members for their input that went into the Bills that will be called on this order, and particularly I'd like to extend my appreciation to Republican counterparts. Representative Weller served as the Republican spokesperson on this committee and we appreciate the bipartisan cooperation. And we think that there's a good package that has been put together. House Bill 2399, the first in the package, is the Amendment that becomes the Bill...Amendment #7 provides that there would be drug testing for individuals, who have been convicted of crimes. Both those who are serving sentences in the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

prison system and those where a judge has exercised this discretion to sentence an individual to probation and make a condition of probation that the person refrain from the presence of drugs, cannabis or controlled substances. the former case the Bill provides that before an inmate can be released early from prison as a result of award of meritorious good time, that the individual first undergo a drug test and be shown to be in fact drug free. As you know, we passed out a number of Bills, three actually, that have increased the amount of meritorious for inmates. good time Representative Stern. Representative Ropp, Representative Harris all presented Bills that passed this General Assembly. The flip side of that before an inmate should be receiving meritorious good time and being released early individual should undergo drug testing to show that, in fact, the person is, while in prison, drug free. The second part of the Bill, would provide and require that where a judge had placed a person on probation, ordered that person as a condition of probation to be drug free or to be absent from the presence of drugs that where a probation officer determines that a drug test is needed that the probationer must submit to a drug test as ordered by the probation officer in those cases and a failure to conform to a drug free status while on probation would, fact, under that circumstance be grounds for a petition to revoke probation. The Bill also provides that there would be created a youth drug abuse prevention fund administered by DASA and that DASA would be authorized to make grants from that fund to defray the costs of the drug test, both by the Department of Corrections and by the Probation Office. I would answer questions and would ask then that we adopt Amendment 7."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to adopt Amendment 7. On that question the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ropp: "Representative, I asked this question before and I want to see if it is still a part of it. I commend you for this effort, but I'm wondering whether or not in this Amendment there is any provision for assistance on behalf of the department to help those people who may currently show up positive with drugs in their system?"

Homer: "You're talking about inmates that are in prison?

There's nothing in the Bill to address that other than the incentive that would be provided to inmates to stay drug free in prison, in that if they wanted to get out early with meritorious good time credit, they would first have to be drug free and pass a drug test."

Ropp: "Well, I am wondering whether or not this is enough incentive because many people who are involved with drugs almost are directed to go to agencies that provide them help, Alcoholics Anonymous or any number of programs and if this doesn't, then maybe we're wasting out time with all these drug assessment programs that we have, attempting to help people dry out. And I'm...I'm wondering whether or not the incentive is enough to help cure a person from being involved in drugs by just saying I'll give you a few days extra time so you can get out earlier, or if in fact it might have been better to establish some kind of assistance on behalf of the department to...to help those people who are involved with drug addiction."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Homer,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

the...the language having to do with probation as a sentence and the testing this is part of the Flinn Bill and part of the Petka Bill...it was my understanding that we were going to put those Bills together and that the language that talked about the random drug testing of probationers would be kept in, and I believe it is in, and then furthermore it would also call for a mandatory revocation per the statutes if you tested positive. Am I correct in understanding that the...the step including the mandatory revocation is not included?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "The...I think it's mainly a dispute as to semantics, Representative Stephens. There is nothing in specifically about mandatory revocation, but obviously if a condition of probation is violated and it would be in this case if someone used drugs while on probation, then logical chain of events would be that the state's attorney would file a petition to revoke probation and i f proved...if it proved its case, the court would provoke the probation. I think that's implicit, you know there are a lot of conditions of probation in the law now and none them specifically say that a violation shall constitute a revocation of probation, but certainly that's what happens in practice."

Stephens: "Well, Representative, I...I guess what you're saying it's implicit in the law. I think that some of us supported language that was a little more explicit, that said that as it is now as I understand the way this will operate, and I'm familiar with it because we have this program in one of the counties I represent. They are...when they test positive if they're on probation and they test positive, they...the judge knows nothing about that. That test is not reported to the courts, they are

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

just remanded for...evaluation to a drug treatment center support the random drug testing. I'm a little disappointed, I'm somewhat disappointed that we don't the step in there that was in the House Bill 3650 that said the probation would be revoked. Now I understand that when you say that probation would be revoked, that there is a matter of due process that's explained in the statutes the way that is handled. I'm going to rise in support of the Amendment, but I think that we need to go one step further so that when people...recognize that the court has put as punishment someone on probation, in other words left them on the street, and that as a condition of probation said that you will be tested randomly there's an assumption on the part of the public that...that if you violate the current substance abuse you test positive for drugs...there's assumption by the public that you would lose your probation and that you would wind up being punished appropriately by jail sentence. And that's not the case in this Bill, and I think we made a step in the right direction by the random drug test. I think that ought to further strengthened. And I will work with you and Representative Petka next year to add the strength to this So, I rise in support of the Amendment I think it goes in a step in the right direction, but not far enough."

Homer: "Okay. Let me just respond by saying that again, I don't think there is much difference between Representative Petka's Bill and this one. His Bill, as I understand it, does say that violation of this provision shall constitute grounds for revocation, but clearly that's implicit in this Bill, and further, just because..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Stephens' five minutes were up. Perhaps you can finish in your close.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I might answer the Gentleman from Madison's questions. The original Bill was 2916 by number and it never ever had any compulsory revocation of probation. A decision had to be made by the court whether or not to try to help the person to quit drugs or whether to revoke his probation. Now, if we revoke the probation we still have to go back to the courts. Stephens was a Sponsor of the original Bill, and he withdrew and called it too weak. And then we switched the Bill with numbers, and that's about all we did, instead of calling it 2916 we started calling it 2399, Mr. signed on again. And I understand he may...or he might have already withdrawn from this Bill... I suspect that he's got a motive other than helping the drug problem in the back of his mind although I can't read his mind. I strongly suspect he's got a problem with this particular I certainly don't have any problem with him supporting the Amendment or the Bill, when it comes up."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik.

The Gentleman from Will, Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Petka: "Representative, as you explained the Amendment you indicated that the costs of the tests would be born by DASA. Is there any reason why we did not include or consider having the person who is placed on probation possibly picking up this cost rather than putting it on the taxpayers?"

Homer: "Actually, Amendment 7, Representative Petka has the test performed, not by DASA, but by the probation department, but it's been changed. One of the earlier Amendments said

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

DASA, but Amendment 7 has the testing done by probation. Now, in addition, another Bill that's coming up we set up a funding mechanism whereby there would be an income tax check off and part of that money would go into this program to help defray the costs of testing. But whether there is sufficient money from that program or not is not known and it's conceivable that...that part of the probation fee would have to be utilized to help pay for the drug test. Let me just finally say, Representative Petka that I'm told that these tests are not extremely expensive, I think they're five or six dollars. I don't know really what the cost is overall, but I don't know that cost is going to become a material issue."

Petka: "I think it's really a question of symbolism as far as making the offender pay. But I also stand in support of this Amendment. I do not think the difference between our Bills, Representative, this semantical difference, but I do understand what we are doing here. And I do think it's a step in the right direction, maybe next year we'll go a little further."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."
Kubik: "Move the previous question, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Homer to close.

Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "Yes. We've heard the debate. I move to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2399 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye',..."

Homer: "Madam. Madam."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, 'Shall Amendment #7 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. All those in favor say'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?" Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Homer, why do you seek recognition?"

Homer: "Madam Speaker...I would ask leave to have the Bill heard on the Order of Third. I know earlier in the day that you indicated that there was some agreement, however, since then we've done this on a variety of Bills. I don't believe that agreement has actually been in effect, Madam these Amendments. Speaker, become the Bill...these Amendments become the Bill, it doesn't seem to make sense to carry this order of business over to another day, when the same issues will be before us identically tomorrow that are here today. These Amendments are the And I would ask leave to have...I would like the Bill. board to reflect this as Representative Flinn's Bill, but I would like to ask leave that Representative Flinn be allowed to present his Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer, I have been requested to ask all Members to hold Bills that have been held on Second over until tomorrow for Third Reading...If you would like to come up and talk about it, we can certainly converse on it. The next Bill is House Bill 2957. Out of the record. House Bill 3144, Representative Krska. Clerk, read the Bill."

Homer: "Madam Speaker...but Madam Speaker."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3144, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

119th Legislative Day

- May 17, 1990
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Krska."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Krska."
- Krska: "Amendment #2 is a technical change inserting the word
 'intent to cause death or bodily harm'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Countryman, for what reason do you seek recognition? This is Amendment #2 to House Bill 3144."
- Countryman: "Well, I was going to question the germaneness of this Amendment, but maybe I don't have the right Amendment.

 But I have Amendment #2 to House Bill 3144 dealing with Spray Paint Manufacturer's Liability Act. That's the Amendment. I question its germaneness."
- Speaker Breslin: "We're looking at it. Excuse me, Representative
 Krska, I see. Representative Krska says he'd like to
 withdraw Amendment #2. Are there any further Amendments,
 Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Krska."
- Krska: "Amendment #3 is a technical change to insert the word
 'intent to cause death or bodily harm'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 3144. And on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 3337, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3337, a Bill for an Act to promote

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

drug free work place. Second Reading of the Bill.
Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.'

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Didrickson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Table Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to table Amendment 1 to House Bill 3337. On that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and Amendment 1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Would you withdraw Amendment #2, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw 2, any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton...is not here.

Representative Homer, what is your pleasure.

Homer: "Table, please."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment 3 to House Bill 3337. And on that question is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment 3 is tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Didrickson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson...withdraws 4. Any

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

further Amendments? She withdraws 4."

Didrickson: "Table."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #5 is...creates the drug free work place. It provides the where there's a state contract and a contractor has a contract for more than \$5000 and has fifteen or more employees that contractor is subject to the provisions of this Act, which require a drug free work place, and the employer would be required to publish a statement that would be conspicuous to all the employees setting forth the rules regulations concerning the drug free work place. And the employer would also be required to establish a drug awareness program among the employees. There would also be a reporting requirement that the employee would be required report to the employer convictions, any criminal convictions, the violation of the drug statutes and the employer would have to establish disciplinary proceedings up to and including discharge of an employee who failed to comply with the nature of a drug free work place. The Bill is designed to try to insure that in the work place that employees have a right to be working with colleagues who are not...who are not using drugs and to insure a high quality work product that would inure to contracts that are let by the State of Illinois. This is an important It sends an important signal. measure. Although it's currently limited to state employees...or state contracts rather. It's a serious matter and something that we need to establish leadership in and hope that the private sector follows this example. Most employees don't want to be associated with others who use drugs. This Bill encourages the abstinence in drug use, and insures a more safety

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

environment in which to perform the duties of the work place. So I would answer questions and urge your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 5 to House Bill 3337. And on that question the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund?"

Wennlund: "Will the Sponsor yield, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will. Representative Homer will yield to a question."

Wennlund: "Representative Homer,...would this Amendment apply to a state road builder, for instance, who received a contract to improve Interstate 55?"

Homer: "Yes."

Wennlund: "Would it also apply...would it apply also any subcontractor hired by that general contractor to make any improvements under the umbrella of the entire state contract?"

Homer: "No."

Wennlund: "It would not include employees of a subcontractor, is that correct?"

Homer: "No. That is correct."

Wennlund: "But...even though the subcontractor may have a subcontract with the general to do work on a state road project or any other state project in excess of \$5000?"

Homer: "Yes. The reason that you know...I...we were involved in the Comptroller's Office in negotiations on this Bill, and it was determined that it was going to be enough of a task to monitor the contracts and it was felt that there was an adequate ability right now to...in the Comptroller's Office to...to also review and consider all of the various subcontracts. So, this is a first step. This Bill does

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

not take into consideration subcontracts."

Homer: "I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?"

Wennlund: "Would any provisions of the Amendment require testing by the general contractor or its employees?"

Homer: "No. There's no testing of employees whatsoever in this Amendment."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before I comment on this Amendment, I just want to commend Representative Homer for his bipartisan approach, his inclusive approach as we've worked on putting together a seven Bill package, a bipartisan package of anti-drug Bills. And Representative Homer, I thank you for being bipartisan, and in being very inclusive. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a...this Amendment is an Agreed Amendment. It's a bipartisan Amendment. All the Members of the Anti-Drug Task Force are Cosponsors of this Bill. I move for it's adoption and move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hultgren: "Representative, I understand that this applies not only to contractors, but to grantees who might receive a grant from the State of Illinois, is that right?"

Homer: "It...yes."

Wennlund: "So for example, a community that might receive a grant from the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, 1

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

think of a CEDAP grant for example, or the City of Chicago that would be receiving grants, or other...the Park District and so forth. Does this then impose upon those units of municipal government the responsibility to comply with this Act as well?"

- Homer: "As I read this...the definition of a...on page 2, I believe that you are correct. It would apply to both contracts and to grants, and...go ahead."
- Wennlund: "Well, I'm just curious as to what kind of an obligation we're putting on local governments here, because, you know between the work of DCCA and the Department of Transportation and City Beautiful and so forth and so on, it would appear to me that we might be involving virtually every unit of local government with the mandates of this new Act. Am I misreading it? You found something that I didn't see?"
- Homer: "Representative Hultgren, if you look at page 2 of Section III. It talks about contracts and grants. It...it's dealing with contracts or grants for the procurement of any property or services. So I don't think it would stretch so far as to take into account CEDAP grants to local communities. I think...I don't think that would be for the procurement of property or services from the state."
- Wennlund: "I saw what you referred to in Section III and then I read ahead to Section IV, where it indicates that the state shall not enter...make a grant of more than \$5000 unless the contract or grant includes a certification and so forth. You're suggesting then that the language of Section III also is carried over and limits the application of Section IV?"
- Homer: "Well, it either does or if you look at Section IV it says that you won't get a grant unless you sign a certificate

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

saying you will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution and so forth of controlled substances in the performances of the contract. So, you know, if in fact it's interpreted otherwise, it certainly would not be a significant hurdle, an obstacle for a community to sign a statement that these proceeds will not be used in an illegal drug trafficking manner."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative...the question is, 'Shall Amendment 5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Didrickson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the Chamber, I offer Amendment #6, which is the work place drug testing It had been House Bill 4063. I do this because I Bill. think it's about time that we in the State of Illinois set public policy with regards to safety in the work place. Before we have a judicial...judiciary who will be setting public policy for us. We have the potential with the concern right now with making our work place safety with a law suit which would then allow for appeal, and we would have a patchwork of system of laws across the state that would have been set by the appellate courts. What we seek to do here is put together a balanced Bill. It's balanced in terms of the employers. And it's balanced in terms of the employees. And it doesn't allow for willy-nilly drug testing, but it does provide procedures and guidelines with regard to that drug testing. It says that there are certain key components for preemployment testing with regards to hazardous work place. It also says

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

that if you are going to drug test once you have employees, has to be reasonable cause. It provides confirmatory tests. It provides for chain of custody. provides for a medical review officer to review those tests. It also puts in place an EAP, an Assistance Program, that the employer must have. It also says that the employer must have a written policy. I think it is time when we look at the cost of drugs in the work place to society and whether or not we are going to remain competitive. If we look just in the state of Illinois. it's a five billion dollar problem. What we seek to do with this is to reduce work comp. costs. We have increased health care costs because of unsafe work places. lower productivity. We have absenteeism and theft. interesting because we have sixty-five percent of employees coming into the work place today grew up during They bring those problems with them. the drug culture. One in five workers as a matter of fact is what we are looking at today with a drug problem. And it's not only a drug problem, but it is also when you have a drug problem in the work place you have people who are drug dealing. You and I, the rank and file, really don't want to be working side by side next to somebody who is either spaced out on drugs or booze. I think that has been recognized by the UAW, who has now called for a drug testing policy. has also been recognized by the Chicago construction trades, and I think it is only within days probably before we see a major employer, who potentially can announce a universal drug testing program. I think it's time that we set policy in this chamber and in this state. I'd be qlad to answer any questions. And I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage...the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

adoption of Amendment 6 to House Bill 3337. On the question the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer. Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to oppose the Lady's Amendment and to point out that this Amendment is not a product of the Drug Task Force. This was a...in a Bill that the Lady had introduced. It was assigned to Labor and Commerce Committee and did not get voted out of that committee. There are many reasons to oppose this Bill. Her Bill...her Amendment unlike Amendment 5 would...would allow for drug testing and establish criteria for drug testing in the work place. Now, whether or not you are for drug testing in the work place, let me say to you that both business and labor are opposed to Amendment #6. has been talking to many of you, AFL-CIO, the State Chamber, all opposed to Amendment #6 because they feel, rightly so, that if there is to be drug testing in the work place it ought to be a matter that's left to negotiation between the parties at the bargaining table and should not be mandated by legislation. Let's face it, labor, like business are both opposed to drugs in the work place. Neither want it, but these are matters left best to the bargaining table. Furthermore, her Amendment would go well beyond Amendment 5. Her Amendment would include within the Bill, not only state contracts for \$5000 or more, but all local contracts including city, county, township, school district, park district or any other unit of would be pulled into this Bill by virtue of her Amendment. By so doing, we would be preempting home rule in those communities that now are left...allowed to contract freely, like the City of Chicago and others. We would, this legislation, be dictating to those units of local government, rules and regulations regarding this matter. I

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

would submit to you that that would be a preemption of home rule, would be stretching this Bill well beyond its intended purpose. This Bill is uniform...this Amendment is uniformly opposed by most business and all labor groups that I'm aware of. And I would hope that we would stand...I know the Lady is well meaning, but I would hope that we would stand in opposition to the Amendment, which is not an Agreed Amendment or part of the Drug Task Force work product."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Saltsman: "This is similar to the Bill that you lost in Labor Committee on a Roll Call vote? This Amendment is?"

Didrickson: "Well, that was the Labor and Commerce Committee.

And on a bipartisan Roll Call you got, but that's usually how those Bills go, Representative Saltsman. You've spent a lot of time in that committee."

Saltsman: "Well, to the Amendment. First of all, I believe in drug testing, but I also believe in the collective bargaining system. And with this piece of legislation you're taking away the collective bargaining You're taking away the fairness of what could happen to an employee. The employees and their organizations should have a right to know the process of where it is going to be processed, what laboratories it's going to and who's going to monitor the program. There's nothing in here to do that, and as many of the people on this side of the aisle know, if you were really serious about this Bill, if you were really serious about the war on drugs, if you were really serious about drug testing, you would not have tried to put this Amendment on this fine piece of legislation,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

because this is nothing more than a killer Amendment. Now, let's be serious about drugs and withdraw this Amendment, and let's let Representative Homer and the other side of the aisle that worked on this fine drug legislation, let's let them get out of here with a clean Bill and without a killer on it. Let's be serious about drugs and not bring this type of legislation or these type of Amendments to the Floor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. I realize that this apparently is not part of what had been agreed to. I rise in support of it, however, because I think the Lady's argument is compelling. I believe that on an issue of this where such important rights as privacy and other considerations predominate, it is very proper for the state to determine the procedure to be used. It would be nice if we could leave this to collective bargaining, but I don't believe that this is an appropriate area to delegate away to private unions and employee and labor groups. So, I rise in support of the Amendment."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Members of this Chamber I would hope that this Bill or this Amendment has not been misrepresented. There has been some on going dialogue with the business groups, clearly they are not in opposition to this. At best they are probably neutral and recognize that its time is almost come in here. That we should be addressing this. I think with regards to the concerns that they had for the City of Chicago, and the fact that this was going way beyond the scope, it's not true. We are only drug testing with regards to hazardous

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

occupations. It does not effect the City of Chicago. And as I mentioned, the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld drug testing with regard to the Department of Transportation. We believe that this Bill has been crafted to be Constitutionally sound. And I would ask for your affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 39 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'no'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 3610. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3610, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. This...I would move Homer: the adoption of Amendment #1, which is a revision to the Criminal and Civil Property For...Forfeiture Acts, that are currently in the Illinois Criminal Code in the Chapter 56 1/2 provisions dealing with controlled substances and cannabis. Currently, there are conflicting and differing of procedural mechanisms for handling the uniform disposition of property that has been seized under various parts of the Illinois statutes. This is an attempt by the Illinois Criminal Justice Authority to try to bring a uniformity to the forfeiture provisions and it establishes

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

both a judicial and nonjudicial procedure for the uniform forfeiture of drugs and also establishes a uniform method distribution of the assets and property which has been seized to make them consistent with the existing provisions of the Narcotic Forfeiture Act, where fifty percent of the seized property goes to the unit of local government involved in the arrest. Twenty-five percent goes to the multi-county drug enforcement groups and twelve and one half percent goes to the county states attorney, and twelve and one half percent to the states attorney appellate prosecutor 'program. And removes the current problem whereby this certain provisions in this statute regarding forfeiture would have the state police make these decisions in a nonuniform way. And so this Bill is designed to...to provide uniform methods of distribution in seizure and due process for property that has been seized. I would answer any question and ask for the adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield? Representative Homer, in the current standards, process or statutes, what is the breakdown now as it pertains to property that has been obtained by law enforcement officers at a drug arrest? Isn't that split up at the local level? I didn't hear you say anything about the local. Tell me what it is now. I think you're trying to reduce it at the local level, if I understand you correctly."

Homer: "No. No. No. Not at all."

Mautino: "Tell me what it is now, and how it compares to what you are proposing."

Homer: "Now, it is fifty percent to the local unit of government, whose police officers participated in the investigation and arrest."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Mautino: "That was fifty percent, right?"

Homer: "Fifty. Yes. Fifty percent. Another twenty-five percent goes to the multi-county drug enforcement groups..."

Mautino: "That's current? Yes?"

Homer: "That is current. Twelve and a half percent goes to the local county states attorney that prosecuted the case."

Mautino: "For the drug...drug fund to do things...?"

Homer: "Well, it goes into the county...county."

Mautino: "Right...what else?"

Homer: "Then the other twelve and a half percent goes to the Illinois States Attorneys Appellate Service Project."

Mautino: "Now what do you want to do with yours?"

Homer: "The same thing. But you see in the current law, Representative Mautino, there's a provision...there are various forfeiture provisions in the current law, and one of those provisions is called the 505 Civil Forfeiture Provisions allow all the money or all the assets to go to the Director of the State Police and then he decides how the money is to be divided up. Therein lies some of the problems that has been created intergovernmentally. So, what we want to do is say that...that all the monies forfeited will go according to the existing method of distribution. I think, you will find..."

Mautino: "Which is 50 percent local and 25 percent States
Attorney 12 1/2, 12 1/2 as you mentioned?"

Homer: "Well, 25 percent MEG, 12 1/2 States Attorney, 12 1/2 to the Appellate Prosecutor."

Mautino: "And that's the way it is supposed to be, but we have to put it in statute because it is not occurring, is that right?"

Homer: "That's right. In some cases it's not occurring."

Mautino: "What do you mean, in some cases it's not occurring?"

Homer: "Well, as I say, there is one provision in the...one

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

forfeiture provision known as a civil forfeiture under Chapter 56 1/2 that has all of the forfeited assets going to the Director of the State Police. And then under that provision he decides under current law where to distribute the money..."

Mautino: "That's enough. The light bulb went off. I understand now. Alright. Fine. Sounds like a good Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Will the Gentleman vield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Countryman: "Representative Homer, you indicated to me and the Judiciary Committee that you would take three of these Bills and have them Republicans chief Sponsors and three would be Democrats. Which three are the Republican sponsored Bills?"

Homer: "Representative Countryman, what I said to you at that time was that each Bill...each Bill would have three Democrat hyphen Sponsors and two Republican hyphen Sponsors. All of them have that ratio. All of them. All of them."

Countryman: "I respectfully disagree, Representative."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative
Daniels and Petka."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daniels and Petka. Mr. Petka.

Representative Petka on Amendment 2. Withdraw #2. 2
through 6, Representative Petka, are your Amendments. Do
you wish to do the same for 3, 4, 5 and 6? Withdraw

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

numbers 3, 4, 5 and 6. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 3611, Representative Santiago. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 36ll, a Bill for an Act to amend the Drug Paraphernalia Controlled Act. Second Reading of the Bill...it's been read a Second time previously. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Speaker Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Homer and Weller."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Withdraw Amendment #1, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 does three things. Very briefly it creates a civil liability. cost of action for...in situations where a person uses property of another to facilitate a drug offense, it allows a cause of action by the owner of that property. Where you have a person who delivers a controlled substance or cannabis to a minor child under the eighteen, it gives a cause of action to the parent of guardian of the child, and it is against the person who delivered the controlled substance or cannabis. And it provides a range of damages to be awarded by the court to such victims in those cases. This is a Bill that had been offered by Representative Countryman that is incorporated in the Bill. The Bill creates tougher penalties for the delivery of controlled substances in large amounts. Ву reducing

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

amount necessary to constitute a higher class felony in some cases, or to trigger a higher minimum mandatory sentence than others. The Bill...that portion of the Bill deals strictly with delivery. Sale of controlled substances does not increase the penalty in any way for possession of controlled substances. The focus being on making tougher penalties for those who would deliver or sell drugs. The final part of the Bill is the portion of Bill the that was...that strengthens the drua paraphernalia law, that's become known as the Father Clement's Bill. And that has also been included to provide that it should be a Class IV felony for any deliver or sell drug paraphernalia to any individual. if the individual is under eighteen it would be a Class III felony. I would urge your support for Amendment 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 3611. On the question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House Bill 4023, Representative Turner. Representative Turner? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4023, a Bill for an Act concerning driver education. Second Reading of the Bill. It's been read a Second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted on May 11th."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Withdraw, please."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "The Amendment #3, Madam Speaker, would amend the Bill itself provides that driver education programs in the schools shall develop a program on drunk driving and substance abuse as part...an integral part of that program. Amendment 2 says that for the purpose of teacher education and certify...a certified teacher in Illinois that as a condition thereof the teacher shall undergo a unit of instruction regarding the training...training in drug and substance abuse education. And that should become a prerequisite for a teaching certificate. The idea of the Bill as amended to provide for training of young people alcohol and drug consumption and how it affects driving and to educate teachers on recognizing symptoms students that may have drug dependency or drug use manifestations. I would urge support for the Amendment."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Cullerton in the Chair.

Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On
that is there any discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Indicates he will. Representative Homer."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Homer, Mr. Homer, I had a similar question on a Bill we had here a couple of days ago. This is, I think, an excellent concept and that indeed people who are going to be teachers probably ought to have had some training in how we go about educating young people about avoiding drug and substance abuse. However, you have stated in this Amendment that that kind of training for

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

teachers is now a prerequisite to receiving certification to be either an early childhood, elementary, special or high school teacher. Does that apply to just those people who are getting certified for the first time? Or does it apply to those people who are getting certificates renewed as well?"

Homer: "What was the answer that the Sponsor gave you to that question?"

Cowlishaw: "The other issue, which quite frankly was not a very substantial Bill, Mr. Homer, was that, no. it only applied to people who were being certified for the first time. This is a very serious matter. I don't suppose this nation has ever been engaged in a war that was more threatening than this drug abuse problem is in this nation right now. Representative Homer, for the purpose of legislative I would like you to tell us whether this simply applies to people who are attempting to be certified as teachers for the very first time, in which case it may begin to do some good within say anywhere from one to two decades. or whether it applies not only to those people applying for certification for the very first time, but whether it applies also to everyone who comes forward to have that certificate renewed?"

- Speaker Cullerton: "Okay. Representative Homer is going to answer that question in person. This is...Timer is running."
- Cowlishaw: "...have to do that, too. I know he cares about the IEA."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Are we in the Order of Education?

 Representative Homer?"
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your patience.

 The...I've read the language of the Bill again, and it

 was...it's my understanding that this provision would only

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

those teachers who will apply toward be certified after...after this Bill becomes law. And it does not apply to current teachers. However, I don't necessarily oppose the Lady's suggestion that it should apply to current teachers, and perhaps that should be looked upon as a...an Amendment to another Bill or other legislation, because certainly an argument could be made that not only new teachers, but current teachers need to be educated in this area. However, the Bill itself, the intent of the Bill itself, I believe is limited to those teachers who will gain their certificate after the Bill becomes law."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Homer, I regret that you would consider this issue as something that you might want to even look at as a possibility for an Amendment in the Senate, because truly I do believe this is important enough that not just those people being certified for the first time, but probably all of those who are having certificates renewed ought to be included within these provisions. Thank you, Representative Homer."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This discussion has confused me.

Now, as written what does Amendment #3 require of a...if it
becomes law...of a teacher who was certified after
September 1, 1981?...and before the effective date of this
legislation?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer?"

Homer: "Well, any teacher who becomes certified after this Bill would be signed into law, which of course simplicitly would be after September 1 of 81 would be required to get the training."

Dunn: "What about those who were certified in September...in 1983?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Homer: "They would not be covered by the Bill."

Dunn: "Why does it then say that after September 1, 1981, they shall complete training in drug and substance abuse...?"

Homer: "Because those people have already...those people have already received their certificate...and so obviously...we can't...you know, it's too late to require them to get training."

Dunn: "Then why does the Amendment say after the...all people receiving their license after the effective date of this law...This Amendment does clearly impose an additional restriction upon those who have as you indicated duly received a license...certification to teach in the State of Illinois. And the language of the Amendment indicates that they must...this becomes law do something else, which is very unusual for us to do to say you had your license yesterday, now to keep it today, you have got to do this. I think the Amendment needs...if I understand what you want to do...the Amendment need rewritten to say that it applies to all licenses issued after the Bill becomes law. That's what you intend to do, isn't it?"

Homer: "Representative Dunn, I recognize your point, but of course that's reference in the Section to September 1, or 81 was obviously put in there when the provision was adopted back in 1981, that established a requirement for course work and instruction of psychology of the exceptional child."

Dunn: "I understand that. Teachers who became..who become licensed since then have probably completed those courses and now we're going to go back and tell those teachers that they must have this. Why don't you rewrite the Amendment? To make it say what you want."

Homer: "Well, maybe that should be done to comport to the legislative intent that I'm trying to read into this Bill.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Cowlishaw would like to your interpretation be in effect. What I said to her was that legislative intent that is not my intent to this legislation to require teachers prior to this Bill passing to receive this education to obtain a certificate which they already have. But I have no problem with amending the Bill in the way that you suggest to make it part of the language of the Amendment."

Dunn: "I appreciate your statement of intent. I do think the language is plain that it says something different than you intend, and I think we ought to take the Bill out of the record just long enough to prepare а different Amendment...Oh, It's not your Bill, I quess. wait. So. the Sponsor may not want to do that. Anyway, I think the Amendment should not be adopted in its present form."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Representative Homer, do
 you want to close?"

Homer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, we passed...actually, this Amendment...passed out of this House on Third Reading in virtually the same form that it is, so if we erred, then we already have done so. With regard to that issue, I don't think it is a major issue. The Amendment simply says that teachers, as a condition, a prerequisite of getting a teacher's certificate, receives instruction on drug prevention and drug detection. And I think it is a very reasonable thing to include in the curriculum for teachers and I would urge support for the Amendment."

Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there is 104 voting 'yes'...Hallock and Bugielski vote 'aye'...106, okay.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Okay, who wants to get on this? Representative Tenhouse votes 'aye'. Tenhouse. Representative Wennlund votes 'aye'. On this question there 108 voting...Representative Black votes 'aye'. On this there is 109 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments. Third Reading. Representative LeFlore, Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Narcotics Profit Forfeiture Act. Third Reading of the Bill...correction, that's Second Reading of the Bill. And there are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Weller and Williams."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller and Williams? Could you read that again, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Weller and Williams."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller and Williams.

Representative Weller on Amendment #1."

Weller: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that that Amendment #1 be withdrawn."

Speaker Cullerton: "That's what I thought. Withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 being offered by Representative Weller and Williams."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller and Williams?"

Weller: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that Amendment be withdrawn."

Speaker Cullerton: "That's what I thought. Withdraw Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Cullerton: "Alright. Representative Homer, Amendment
#3."

119th Legislative Day May 17, 1990

Homer: "Withdraw the Amendment, please."

Speaker Cullerton: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Any further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4 offered by Representatives Weller and Williams."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller on Amendment #4."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the right Amendment sponsored by Representative Weller and Representative Williams. It's part of the bipartisan anti-drug package. putting together this evening. This legis...this Amendment establishes the Drug Free Youth Program, which takes a different approach to how we communicate to our young people about becoming involved with Traditionally, we've always threatened punishment to our young people if they become involved with drugs. purpose of Drug Free Youth is to reward young people for staying away from drugs. Basically, it will involve existing youth organizations, such as 4-H, YMCA and YWCA. Boys Clubs and Girls Clubs, which will be encouraged to be participate in a drug free youth program, which will be a voluntary program set under quidelines and administered by DASA. So, as I said, Ladies and Gentlemen, it will a...a positive reenforcement program funded through the Youth Drug Abuse Check-Off and administered guidelines set up DASA. It's a good idea. It's part of the bipartisan package, which forty-five will have Cosponsors. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 4067. On that is there any discussion? Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain myself. At the start of this Session, there was this hue and cry to do something about drugs. Don't do that to

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

me...this is the one I asked you to go on about your business. I did not necessarily... I wanted to do something positive, but I didn't know what to do. So, I looked up one day and there was a Weller - Williams Amendment. And I thought I know Representative Jerry Weller is trying his best to do a great job, and this Bill attempts to do something positive. However, I must state that I have great concerns about creating what I call the...I don't know...'I'm willing to piss' youth, I guess. I feel strange about this one. Because of the fact that this particular Amendment, the question becomes not if you are willing to go to the washroom any time or any place, but what if your not. You presume that if you don't join one of these groups that you are using drugs. What if in fact you live in places where they don't have these little youth groups? So, I respectfully stand to be neutral Amendment. And I tell the rest of the world that if you think this is a positive thing, please move forward, but I personally cannot in all good consciousness stand up and support my Amendment at this time. So, all I tell you you think this is positive, please move forward. Mr. Weller, good luck."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Well, that takes the cake. Here we were in this Drug Task Force and the Vice Chairman of committee. my Representative Williams, we kept looking for one of his Bills that we might live with to put in the Drug Task Force. And you know, we looked through them and some of them were pretty bad and some of them were kind mediocre, finally decided, and we well, the Bill he introduced creating the Drug Free Youth Program the Bill that we would use to commend Representative Williams

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

for the fine effort that he did in writing that Bill. fact there was even several Bills on this subject and I said we're going to take Representative William's Bill. And here he is tonight standing before us saying that he doesn't like that Bill. I would like to but in all seriousness, it's a good explanation of that. Amendment. What it does, you know, we often times attacking the drug problem want to put people in jail, which we should, who violate the laws. We want to take their assets, which we should. But here's a chance to do something to encourage youth to be drug free, and what this would allow them to do is a voluntary testing. Ιf wish to undergo it, it would qualify them if they're drug free for an identification card that businesses, hopefully, like McDonalds and others would give a discount to if a youth came under eighteen and presented a drug free youth card. You know, positive reenforcement, that's what measure is about. Trying to encourage young people to stay drug free and show them that there are rewards for doing that. It's a voluntary program. It's a good positive And even though Representative Williams is now program. having second thoughts, I hope he will come back to realize that his idea was a darn good one and reendorse it."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Anthony Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there really is one provision in this Amendment that's not a joking matter, that we should seriously consider, the provision that I find objectionable is the one that says there will be a preference given in awarding Illinois State Scholarships to youth who are certified in this program. And so my concern is what you are actually doing is taking someone who is 13 or 14, 15

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

and placing him in the position maybe he doesn't feel that he has to take a urine analysis and prove to anyone that he is drug free and just the fact that he doesn't want to prove something means that he would not receive the Illinois State Scholarship that we cannot adequately fund right now. So, by allowing a preference for something as important as the Illinois State Scholarship to this youth movement, I don't think it is a good idea."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Representative from Macon...Dunn. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would recommend a 'present' vote on this Amendment. Unless we adopt a further Amendment which would indicate that no one would be eligible to receive a refund on their Illinois income tax unless they have proven themselves to be drug free by urinalysis. If we're going to do this to get a state scholarship, why should be do it with tax refunds. So, I would recommend a 'present' vote until we require everyone in the State of Illinois, who deals with state government in any manner or form to approve they are drug free by means of a urinalysis test."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller to close."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, over the last several weeks you've heard a lot of ideas being tossed around regarding young people. Some ideas have been punitive, threatening young people with some sort of punishment should they become involved with drugs or alcohol. People have risen up and said those are horrible ideas because we are punishing young people for becoming involved with drugs or alcohol. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is where we are rewarding young people for staying away from drugs and alcohol. That's the way we want them to be. Simply a drug free preference for youth

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

state scholarships and state jobs as a positive reward. It's no difference than the preference we already have place for veterans. Ladies and Gentlemen, this idea is an idea that works. I surveyed twenty-five hundred students the eighty-fifth legislative district. sophomores, juniors and seniors and seventy-six percent those students said, yes, they would participate in Drug Free Youth if it was a program available today. This program is modeled after a program that is extremely successful in our eastern Texas counties of Smith Tvler. And let me give you some statistics that the community of White House, Texas shared with me today. The Drug Free Youth Program has been in effect for three years. Since that's been in effect, statistics show that the juvenile crime rate is down seventy-one percent. high school SAT scores are up thirty percent. The drop out rate is significantly decreased. Local businesses are offering discounts and noticed an increase in their business. And the program has continued to expand in the five states: Oklahoma, Louisiana, Idaho, New York and Arkansas. It has fourteen thousand members now nationally. Once it only started with a hundred and thirty-three. White House, Texas is a community with a high school of nine hundred students. Eighty-five percent of those students are participating in the Drug Free Youth in Program, and they support it whole heartedly as does their community. Ladies and Gentlemen, T move for the Amendment's adoption and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House...of Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 4067. All in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

Representative LeFlore, the Sponsor of the Bill."

LeFlore: "I'm listed as the Sponsor of this Bill, but since we

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

have had so much discussion I really have to change my mind as to being the Sponsor. So, therefore, I'm going to refer the Sponsorship to Representative Weller."

Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner. One minute to explain your vote."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should say that the Sponsor of this Amendment is a friend of mine, and one who I have the utmost respect for, but it amazes me because one of the previous speakers who spoke in favor of this Amendment, says yes, we need to do this for our youth, but by the same Amendment which would deal with billboard token an companies, which would say they should not advertise within 500 feet of schools was taken out of my Bill. And amazing how we want to deal with our youth. When we want to talk about the companies, those who have large political action committees down here, who have a voice, they tend to get their way. I think that a yellow vote is a good vote on this Amendment and let's treat everybody the same in this Assembly."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Matijevich, one minute to explain your vote."

Matijevich: "Well, it's...the Sponsor of the Amendment said this was a positive thing for kids. I don't consider it positive. Let's say that a kid in all of his years...he might be fifteen years...in all of those fifteen years did not take a bit of drugs, did not come close to it. I think it is demeaning to tell that kid that he ought to take a drug test to prove that he didn't take drugs. I don't think that's positive. I think it is the opposite. I think we've got to do some positive things, but to make somebody prove that they didn't when they never did is not positive, it to me is demeaning. I think it's against one's civil rights."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Representative Morrow, one minute to explain your vote."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 4067. Due to the fact that...due to the fact that we are putting a black mark on our youth, who might have made a bad judgment. Two years ago we almost considered putting a person on the...on the Supreme Court of this United States, a Gentleman who had proved that he was qualified for the bench, and because he had made a mistake when he was young, that mistake carried him into his adult life. We should not put black marks on our youth, because they happened to fall and make a bad judgment because everyone..."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Bring your remarks
 to a close, please."
- Morrow: "...everyone should have the opportunity to make amends for any mistake that they might have done when they were young."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this Amendment there are 49 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. Representative McCracken? I'm looking for some...Representative Weller...Representative Weller is the Sponsor of the Amendment. We took the record."
- McCracken: "Let's Poll the Absentees, Representative Weller...just a suggestion."
- Speaker Cullerton: "I think that's up to Representative Weller if
 I'm not mistaken. Representative Weller requests a Poll of
 the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting: Harris, Ronan, Sutker,
 Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Weller: "Verification of the Negatives?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Weller asks for a Verification of the Negative. Mr. Clerk, please read the list of the negatives."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the negative: Balanoff. Barnes. Bowman. Brunsvold. Capparelli. Cullerton. Currie. Davis. DeLeo. Didrickson. Dunn. Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth. Hartke. Hensel. Hicks. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. McGann. McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Preston. Richmond. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Stern. Terzich. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Wojcik. Wolf and Anthony Young. No further."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any questions of the negative?"

Weller: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Van Duyne? Gentleman is voting 'no'. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Alright...yes. He is."

Weller: "Representative Terzich?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Terzich? Gentleman is voting?

How is he voting?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Terzich? Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him, please."

Weller: "Representative Balanoff?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Balanoff? Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'. Is Representative Balanoff in the chamber? Remove him."

Weller: "Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Mulcahey? The Gentleman is in the chamber."

Weller: "Representative Brunsvold?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Brunsvold? The Gentleman is in his seat. Alright. Representative Balanoff has returned to the chamber. Remove...return him and record him as voting 'no'."

Weller: "Representative Hultgren?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Hultgren? Representative Hultgren is in the chamber."

Weller: "Okay. Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry. Representative Hultgren is
 voting 'present'."

Weller: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Giglio? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is voting 'no'. Representative Giglio? Remove him."

Weller: "Representative Rice?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Nelson Rice? The Gentleman is in his seat. Representative White asks leave to be verified."

Weller: "Fine. Representative...oh, I'm sorry, I can't see him there. Representative Flowers?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Flowers is in her seat."

Weller: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Morrow is in the center aisle."

Weller: "Representative...okay...Representative Stern?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Stern is in the center aisle."

Weller: "Okay. Representative Sutker?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Sutker? The Gentleman is not
 voting, Sir."

Weller: "Okay. Representative Krska?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Krska? The Gentleman is voting 'no'. The Gentleman is in his seat."

Weller: "Okay. Representative Saltsman."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Saltsman? The Gentleman is voting 'no'. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

Representative Saltsman? Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

Remove him."

Weller: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Ronan is not voting, Sir."

Weller: "Okay. Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Kulas is in his seat."

Weller: "Okay. Representative Flinn?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Flinn? How is the Gentleman...Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Weller: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Bruce Richmond? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'.

Please, remove him. Representative Jones asks leave to be
verified."

Weller: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Keane? The Gentleman is voting 'no'. Please remove him."

Weller: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Capparelli? The Gentleman is right in front."

Weller: "Okay. That's all."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Anthony Young, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Breslin, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Breslin votes 'no'. Representative Wyvetter Younge? Representative Wyvetter Younge votes 'no'. Representative Mulcahey?...wishes to vote 'no'. Representative Bugielski...wishes to vote 'no'. Representative Barger...wishes to vote 'aye'.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Saltsman...return him to the Roll Call as a 'no'. Representative Terzich...has returned to the chamber. Record him as 'no'. The Speaker wishes to vote 'no'. On this question there are 50 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. House Bill 4124, Representative Homer."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4124, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Motion filed with respect to Amendment
#1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Homer and Weller."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer and Weller.

Representative Homer and Weller, which one is going to handle this one? Representative Homer...Amendment #2"

Homer: "Thank you...Thank you. We...I'd ask leave to withdraw Amendment 2."

Speaker Cullerton: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Homer and Weller."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer, Amendment #3."

Homer: "Withdraw Amendment 3, please."

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. House Bill 4126,
Representative Homer. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4126, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. It has been read a Second time previously. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Homer
 and Countryman."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer, Amendment #1."

Homer: "Thank you. I move to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Cullerton: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Cullerton."

Homer: "I ask to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Cullerton: "Oh, I can withdraw it myself, Sir. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading...No further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3812...House Bill 3812, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning domestic violence. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this amends the Criminal Code. It provides that an order of protection granting exclusive protection of a residency constitutes notice that a person committing criminal trespass to real property...to a person committing criminal trespass to real property. A person must have

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

notice that he or she is not permitted to remain on the land for a criminal trespass prosecution. It also expands the offenses in conjunction with criminal prosecution to which an order of protection may be issued. These include burglary, residential criminal trespass and residential criminal trespass to a vehicle, criminal trespass to land, and criminal damage to property and telephone harassment. And that it adds additional language to be included in the order of protection stating that entering or remaining present into a specified place when the person is...when a protected person is present is also a violation of order of protection. I'll be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3812. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "I couldn't hear your whole explanation. Part of what I heard was that an order of protection represents notice."

Curran: "That's correct."

Levin: "Does there have to be service on the individual in order to have notice?"

Curran: "The rules of service are not changed with this piece of legislation. Service is the same before this legislation, after this legislation, and before. No change in the way service is granted."

Levin: "So, you see...you still have to have notice though if it is the next party judgment...a judgment that is entered...or next party of protection. You have to serve it on the individual?"

Curran: "I do not know what a next party of protection is, but let me tell you that right now...let me get to the part of the Bill...right now somebody can be notified personally or

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

orally or in writing. This simply adds an order of protection as a method of writing by which somebody can be served notice."

Levin: "But...I guess my question is, that person is not notified if...if he or she is not appraised either in writing or orally or by telephone that an oral order of protection has been entered...what is the effect of adding this provision?"

Curran: "Oh. Okay. Would you repeat your question, Representative?"

Levin: "Alright...once you notify the person..."

Curran: "Are you trying to ask me an easy question or a hard one?"

Levin: "I'm trying to understand this."

Curran: "Okay."

Levin: "Okay. You know, it sounds like a good idea, but I am just having trouble getting it to gel. If a...a order of protection, if you notify the person...okay...either orally or...in writing...or you serve him a copy of the order...okay...he knows about it."

Curran: "That's correct."

Levin: "Alright. Let's say your order of protection is entered and you don't tell that person, are they...do they still technically have notice under your provision?"

Curran: "There is no change as to how a...as to what constitutes notice. What I have been...what I was given in committee was a slip of paper that said an order cannot be enforced unless actual notice has occurred. And so, the method of notice has not changed, nor what constitutes notice has not changed by what appears in this Bill."

Levin: "Thank you."

Curran: "And thank you for your question."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? Rep...Lady from

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Sangamon, Representative Hasara,"

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in complete support of this Bill. Remember that an order of protection is not issued unless there has been some abuse. So, what we're doing by this Bill is extending under what circumstances someone can be in violation of the order. Let me give you just two examples. First of all, right now unless the perpetrator enters the residence, the police cannot intervene in that case, so let's say that the person who needs protection drives up to the home. Under this Bill if that person is attacked in the driveway or in the yard, the order of protection would take...would take effect. also would provide protection for children going to school. So, this is the result of a lot of work by different groups. So, I certainly would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3812 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please, take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'yes'...Representative Morrow wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'...Representative McPike wishes to vote 'aye'...on this question there is 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3812 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative

Munizzi...Munizzi...Representative Munizzi, House Bill 4138. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4138, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to insurance fraud. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

House. House Bill 4138 amends the Criminal Code to add a new article concerning insurance fraud and related offenses. It sets penalties for violation, allows civil damages in certain circumstances and makes the effective date January 1, 1991. This Bill goes after the professional criminal in insurance fraud cases, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for passage of House Bill 4138. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "She indicates she will."

Countryman: "Representative, we had a Bill...Representative

Hartke had a Bill the other day that amends the fraud in
the insurance Bill. Does this Bill repeal the fraud in the
Insurance Code?"

Munizzi: "According to my notes, Sir, it says that it repeals existing insurance fraud provisions."

Countryman: "Why would we want to repeal those?"

Munizzi: "I think that the purpose for doing this...creating specific insurance fraud crimes goes after those specific insurance fraud criminals. In...you know, while certainly those crimes are covered by fraud and conspiracy laws as they exist, insurance fraud goes directly after the professional criminal in insurance fraud cases."

Countryman: "Well, this Bill creates Class I felonies and Class X felonies, is that correct?"

Munizzi: "I believe it does."

Countryman: "Do you have any indication what the prison impact of that is on us?"

Munizzi: "The Department of Corrections has no opposition to the Bill. And was unable to project at this time what impact the Bill would have...on their budget."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Countryman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in reluctant opposition to the Bill. I think we're making a mistake if we repeal the violations in the Insurance Fraud Act. I also think we've gone a bit too far when we start creating a Class X felonies for insurance fraud. I think we ought to seriously consider rejecting this Bill and dealing with Representative Parke's Bill that we've sent to the Senate. Thank you"

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Laurino. Question is will the Sponsor
yield?"

Laurino: "Representative Munizzi, does the Department of Transportation stand behind this Bill?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "The Department of Insurance does not, but the Department of Insurance does."

Laurino: "The Department of Insurance does..."

Munizzi: "DOT does not."

Laurino: "does not?"

Munizzi: "No."

Laurino: "Oh."

Munizzi: "But Insurance does, and I'm so happy you inquired about that."

Laurino: "I'm glad you cleared it up."

Munizzi: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "She indicates...Representative Munizzi would you yield for a question?...absolutely."

Munizzi: "Sure. Sure. Absolutely."

Mautino: "Under what circumstances does your civil damages trigger in?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Munizzi: "Don't get technical here. I'm sorry. What was your question? Can you please repeat the question, Representative?"

Speaker Cullerton: "When does civil damages kick in?"

Mautino: "Under...under what circumstances do you civil damages kick in? Are they civil or are they treble damages?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "The civil damages where the defrauder is liable for twice the amount recovered, or twice the amount attempted to be retained."

Mautino: "It is double damages instead of treble damages then?"

Munizzi: "Representative, I'm sorry, I cannot hear you."

Mautino: "I say, those are double damages rather than treble damages then?"

Munizzi: "That's wonderful. It's the intention of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Munizzi: "Sure."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Munizzi yields for a question."

DeLeo: "No further questions."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4138 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please, take the record. On this question there are 101 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 4138 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Black...Representative Black on House Resolution 1489."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1489 was brought to me by a

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Gentleman who lives in my district who is the State Commander of the American Ex-Prisoners of War. 1489 was passed by the Indiana Resolution House of Representatives on the 12th of February 1990. what HR 1489 does, is, to ask the Department of Justice to continue to work with the government of Panama to arrive at a waiver under the terms of the Geneva Convention of 1949 to waive any and all entitlements, benefits or any type of remuneration, which might result from the granting of prisoner of war status to Manuel Noriega. happy...answer anv questions and ask for your favorable action on HR 1489."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Resolution 1489. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Bill 3895, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill. 3895."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3895, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to county property tax. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Younge on Amendment #1."
- Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Floor Amendment #1 would make the adjoining county from 200,000, but less than 500,000, therefore taking out the possibility of Lake County. This is an Amendment that I promised Representative Wojcik, that I would put on there. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 3895. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Madam...Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield for a question? Representative Younge, as introduced, this Bill would have only effected St. Clair, is that right?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Stephens: "Who did you contact in Lake County?...that wanted you to introduce this Amendment to include Lake County?"

Younge: "This Amendment was introduced in order to take away the possibility that the Bill could affect Lake County, because the only county in Illinois that would be described as a result of this Amendment would be St. Clair County."

Stephens: "So, with this Amendment it just affects St. Clair County?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Stephens: "And who, in St. Clair...well, to the purpose of the Amendment then is to eliminate Lake County to bring this down to just St. Clair County, which is your original intention...okay."

Younge: "That's correct."

Stephens: "Okay."

Speaker Cullerton: "Is there any further discussion? We'd like Representative Younge...Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I don't know. Should we be for this Bill? I think
we should freely give Democratic counties the right to tax
themselves. I don't know. I was asked to stand up and
oppose it, but I'm kind of wondering. Maybe tax relief is
not such a good idea down there. Maybe we should have some
more money raised down there. Will all of the money raised
in the county-wide tax, be used county-wide or will it be
limited to a particular portion of the county?"

Younge: "It would be used county-wide. We're talking about Amendment #1, Representative McCracken."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

McCracken: "Alright. Thank you. I think that since this is a

Democratic issue that maybe we should be voting 'present'

on this side of the aisle. And we'll let them chose
whether they want to have this tax."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "In case we didn't, I'd like the Roll Call on this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry, in case what?"

Kubik: "A Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Cullerton: "You're demanding a Roll Call on this Amendment? Alright. The question is, 'Shall House...Floor Amendment #1 pass?' There's been a request for a Roll Call. All those in favor of Amendment #1 vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please, take the record. On this question there are 47 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Younge."

Younge: "There are two more Amendments on the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry. I thought you were seeking recognition. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Take the Bill out of the record, please."

Speaker Cullerton: "Out of the record. House Bill 3024 — on the Order of State and Local Government. Representative McNamara. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3024, would you read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3024, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial planning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "I'd like to move this Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman asks leave to...Gentleman asks leave to remove...move the Bill from Third to Second Reading. Gentleman...leave is granted. Are there any

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative McNamara, Amendment #2."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an Amendment that merely guts the Bill and what it does is, it provides a vehicle so we can work out a solution between the governmental parties concerned. It has been in agreement between both sides of the aisle."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor
 Amendment #2 to the House Bill 3024. On that is there any
 discussion? The Lady from Cook. Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly rise in opposition to this Amendment. I know that we just recently set a Debt Collection Board...just a few days ago. And now we're going to allow any city that's in trouble, and there's probably a lot throughout the state, to not pay any of their taxes for two years and maybe up to three years after that board goes into...oh, I'm sorry."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Parcells, are you...have you concluded?"
- Parcells: "Thank you. I'm on the wrong Amendment. It's late...the hour is late."
- Speaker Cullerton: "So, you have no objections to the Amendment.

 Okay. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of
 Amendment #2 to House Bill 3024. On that is there any
 further discussion? There being none, all in favor say
 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair
 the 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Any further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Alright. Gentleman asks leave to hear House Bill 3024 on Third Reading. Gentleman

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

have leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3024, a Bill for an Act in relation to financial planning. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you. What this Bill now does is provide a vehicle in order for all governmental agencies to...to work out the problems of this Bill. And we have the assurance that the Bill will not be moved until we get further assurances. It provides that vehicle, and I ask for approval."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3024. And on that question is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall House 3024 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye'...112 voting 'aye', none voting 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Elections appears House Bill 3058...excuse me, the Order of Human Services appears House Bill 3058, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this order...this Bill to the Order of Second for purposes of an Amendment, does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

is granted. Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill reflects an agreement that has been worked out by myself between the Homeless Coalition and the Department of Public Aid. The Bill would authorize the Department of Public Aid to establish a program assisting the homeless by hoping that they would not become homeless, that's why it's called the Homeless Prevention Program. It's contingent upon the state receiving federal matching under the emergency food and shelter something which we should know by the end of the year. it doesn't go into effect unless the Department of Public Aid wishes it to go into effect and if we get the federal matching funds. If they do get the federal matching funds and they want to start the program, then we would have a program that would provide for people who are in danger of losing their homes to receive up to three months supplement to their rent, so they can stay in their home and avoid becoming homeless. So, I would be happy to answer questions and move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 3058. And on that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

119th Legislative Day May 17, 1990

- Cullerton: "This is a technical Amendment suggested by the Department of Public Aid. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 3058. On that question is there any discussion. There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Cullerton asks

 leave for immediate consideration of this Bill as amended.

 Is there any objection? Hearing none,...Representative

 Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not object to hearing this. However, I do have an observation. The Gentleman from Fulton and the Lady from St. Clair I believe had Bills earlier today, were they not in the same position? We're told..."
- Speaker Breslin: "They were on Second and were amended. This is on Third."
- Harris: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, excuse me."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3058, a Bill for an Act in relation to the prevention of homelessness. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Many of you know that there was a Coalition for the Homeless who have spend a good portion of the week here in Springfield lobbying for this Bill. And we had extensive negotiations with the Department of Public Aid, and we have worked out an agreement. This is the type

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

of program that makes sense, because it hopefully will prevent people from becoming homeless in the first place. These are people that have homes, who because of a death or because of the loss of a job need to be tided over. We have made it clear that we're not using any funds which are now being used for shelter prevention. We have worked out an agreement so that we're going to attempt to get some federal reimbursement for programs that are on going. Ιf we're successful in doing that, then we'll use a portion of that money to fund this program. My understanding is that there will be no appropriations until we know whether not we were successful in getting those federal funds. Ιf so, we can do a supplemental. I'd be happy to answer questions. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 3058. And on that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3058 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the next Order of Business is the Order of Elections, Third Reading. Representative Stern you have two Bills on this Order. The first Bill is House Bill 3825, Representative Stern. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3825, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Just a moment. There's an Amendment filed to
 this Bill, Representative Stern. We believe the Bill was
 held on Second, is that correct?"

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Stern: "That is correct, Madam...I wanted to bring it back to Second I believe...No. That's right. It's still on Second."
- Speaker Breslin: "Still on Second. Okay. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative

 Stern and Rice."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, this is the Amendment we discussed earlier that had not been printed and distributed. And it deals with clean up to last year's raffle legislation for campaign committees. We talked about it before and that's it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 3825. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. She wants...okay, this Bill was on Third Reading. She called it back on Second, put the Amendment on, does the Lady have leave for immediate consideration of the Bill. No. There are objections from the Republican side of the aisle, Representative Stern.

 The next Bill is House Bill 3826. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3826, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton in the Chair."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Madam Speaker, House Bill 3826, also filed by Chairman of the Elections Committee, Rice and myself deals really with only Democratic Party matters. It changes the title of a

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

State Central Committee man/female to State Central Committeewoman. It provides that each Member of the Democratic State Central Committee shall be a delegate to the convention, et cetera."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Stern, excuse me. This is House Bill 3826."

Stern: "That's right. That's what I'm giving you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments adopted?"

Stern: "I'm sorry. I'm jumping the gun."

Clerk O'Brien: "There is no Amendments adopted."

Speaker Cullerton: "So, you ask leave to return the...you're about ready to pass the shell Bill. So, you want to bring the Bill back to Second Reading?"

Stern: "I'm sorry. Yes."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Stern and Rice."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Stern on Amendment #1."

Stern: "This Bill deals only with the Democratic Party matters, as I said. It mostly deals with Democratic State Committee men and women serving through their term. Even following the Congressional Reapportionment. Besides the two matters I mentioned, out of turn earlier. This went through the Task Force system just as the others did."

- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."
- Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we acknowledge what Representative Stern has described as the agreeable Amendment and we would move for its adoption."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "She indicates she will."

Kubik: "Representative Stern, have you checked this Amendment with the Chairman of the State Democratic Party to make sure that this is what he wants?"

Stern: "Mr. Kubik, I have, in fact, run it past him, and he seemed satisfied with it."

Kubik: "Okay. Well, we just wanted to make sure of that."

Stern: "He wanted us to take the lead in these matters. And we have done so."

Kubik: "Okay."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Shaw. Representative Shaw? Representative
Shaw, do you wish to seek..."

Shaw: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Representative Stern, what effect does this have on the committeemen?"

Stern: "One of the aspects of the Bill states that following the reapportionment of Congressional districts, the State Central Committeeman and woman will continue to finish out their unexpired terms. In other words, it is possible that we will lose one or two Congress...Congressional districts, but the elected State Central Committeeman and woman will finish their unexpired term even though excluded."

Shaw: "Okay. But it doesn't have any effect on the ward committeeman?"

Stern: "Oh, no effect at all on ward committeemen. No...none at
 all."

Shaw: "It doesn't deal with that. Okay. Okay. What else does it deal with? What else does this Amendment deal..."

Stern: "I can't hear you, Sir...it also provides the...these

State Central Committeemen/female shall be called State

Central Committeewoman. And it provides at the state

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

convention each State Central Committeeman and woman will be an automatic delegate and can appoint two others. That's all. That's the whole Bill."

Shaw: "Sounds like a fine Bill to me."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further Discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb. Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Will the Ladv vield?"

Stern: "Okav."

Speaker Cullerton: "She indicates she will."

Countryman: "Representative Stern, when we need to change the
Republican Party structure in the State Central Committee
at the request of our Chairman, will you let us have a
Republican Bill?"

Stern: "How about it? What can I say, Mr. Countryman?"

Countryman: "Well, I just want you to know, we believe in equal rights around here."

Stern: "Gender balance, almost."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion?"

Stern: "May I defer to... Chairman Rice to close."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative...Representative Rice to close on Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3826. Representative Rice."

Rice: "I appreciate that. I think it has been discussed and at this particular time we'd like to have a favorable vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "All in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye'.

All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the

Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative Novak, House Bill 3952. The Bill is on Third Reading."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I have leave of the House for purposes bringing this Bill back to Second Reading? For purposes of

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, please bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Now, Representative, do you wish to leave it there and..."

Novak: "No. I wish to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, please, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House...House Bill 3952, a Bill for an Act concerning organic labeling. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Novak, Amendment #3."

Novak: "Please withdraw."

Speaker Cullerton: "Withdraw. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker Cullerton: "Do you wish to proceed with this tonight? Or do you..."

Novak: "Yes. Preferably, please. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker,
Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 if
the result of many hours of negotiation with the Illinois
Department of Agriculture and the University of Illinois
School of Agriculture, the Illinois Sustainable Ag
Society, the Department of Public Health, the Organic
Farmer Task Force and the Lincolnland Association up in
Barrington and its many hours of work. I ask for your
adoption."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative
Novak."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Floor Amendment #5 simply answers some concerns related to me by the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and we seem to work out those concerns. And I ask for those adoption...for that adoption."

Speaker Cullerton: "Gentleman has motioned for the adoption of Amendment #5. Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted...#5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative Kulas on House Bill 3183. This Bill is on Third Reading...is the Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Kulas? Mr. Clerk, where is House Bill 3183?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill appears on Second Reading, page 5."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Kulas, would you please take this out of the record for a second and check with Representative McPike? Alright. There has been some requests for some Bills that are on Third Reading to be amended on Second. So, what we would suggest is that we bring these Bills back to Second and leave them there and do the Amendments tomorrow. So, House Bill 3565, Representative Currie. House Bill 3565, Representative Currie, you request this Bill to be returned to Second Reading, is that correct? Please...Representative Currie."

Currie: "Let's put the Amendment...there's a technical Amendment..."

Speaker Cullerton: "It is a technical Amendment?"

Currie: "Yes."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, please, read House Bill 3565."

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a Second time previously.

 Floor Amendment #6 offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie on Amendment #6."
- Currie: "Actually, I move to table Amendment #5, which was earlier adopted."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Lady moves to table Amendment #5. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair that 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted...the Amendment 5 is tabled. On Amendment #6, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Technical Amendment that covers some items that were inadvertantly omitted from Amendment 5. Otherwise it is the same. I move its adoption."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative...Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. Representative McCracken. There being no further discussion, question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative McPike in the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks requests to bring House Bill 4152 back to Second Reading and leave it there for Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman has leave. House Bill 4152, Second Reading. Representative Williamson would like to move House Bill 3567 from Third Reading back to Second Reading and leave it there for Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. House Bill 3567 is on Second Reading. You can do it tomorrow. Representative Lang would like to move House Bill 2867 back to Second Reading and leave it there for Amendments. Are there any

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

objections? Hearing none the Gentleman has leave. House Bill...House Bill 2867 is on Second Reading. Representative Shaw asks leave to bring House Bill 3317 from Third Reading back to Second Reading and leave it there for Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. House Bill 3317 is on Reading. Representative Von Boeckman! Representative Hultgren, conference committee reports, Senate Bill 1333. Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year this General Assembly authorized school districts to receive money from parents groups, booster clubs, that sort of thing for the purpose of construction of a building. And at the request of one of the Members an Amendment was added to that authorization legislation, which restricted the district's levy taxes for maintenance of that building. to That Amendment has created some problems in the Galesburg school district that seeks to utilize this authority to receive money from a booster group and I've talked with the Representative at whose insistence the Amendment was added last year and willing to allow that Amendment to be withdrawn and for the authority to be for the school just to receive those funds from that booster group to construct a school building. This Amendment would clean that up. This Conference Committee Report would clean that up. Ιt has passed the Senate yesterday, my understanding unanimously. And I'd ask for unanimous approval of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "And on...and on the Gentleman's Motion Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's hard to hear but I think...does the Conference Committee Report change the Bill in its entirety and have do with...something about

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

taxes with a referendum?"

Hultgren: "It doesn't change the referendum...it does not change the referendum requirement, John, so long as the increase would be within the school district's permitted levy."

Dunn: "And it has...the thrust of the Bill is to levy...to permit

a referendum to do something about taxes. What does it
have to do with tobacco ban's, is that out of the Bill?"

Hultgren: "It has nothing to do with tobacco...tobacco...it has nothing to do with tobacco ban, John, that was a vehicle that was a vehicle that was used for the clean up."

Dunn: "Okay. That's what I thought. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young, A.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Young, A.: "Is the Bill that Representative Black had the other day in terms of a maybe a tax increase, maybe not, is that in this Conference Committee?"

Speaker McPike: "Why don't you give the Gentleman some attention, please?"

Young, A.: "Is there either a tax increase or an extension of a current tax in this Conference Committee Report?"

Hultgren: "It's not the extension of a current...it doesn't authorize the extension of a current tax over and above what exists in the current statute. No."

Young, A.: "Is there a referendum requirement in this Conference Committee?"

Hultgren: "If it would go over the permitted levy, there would be a referendum just like there would otherwise. Yes."

Young, A.: "What if they are below the levy?"

Hultgren: "If they are below the levy as they can today, they could raise the building tax below...below the point that

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

- would be required for a levy."
- Young, A.: "With or without a referendum?"
- Hultgren: "Below the ceiling they can raise it without a referendum. Representative Young."
- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone rise in opposition to this? Representative Black, are you standing in opposition to this?"
- Black: "Just a comment. My name was mentioned in debate. If the
 Bill I carried is in this Conference Committee Report, it's
 in there without my knowledge, without my consent and I
 know nothing about it. And that be the truth."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes. As I...As I read...Mr. Speaker...As I read the analysis, there is a provision in the law providing a school district may not levy higher taxes for a new building, if the building has not been approved by a referendum. And my analysis is that this Conference Committee Report deletes that provision. And therefore, I would say this would allow a tax without a referendum. Now if you want to vote for that, that's alright, but that's the way I read it."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren, do you want to take this out of the record?"
- Hultgren: "Well, maybe I can talk to Representative Matijevich between now and tomorrow and hopefully we can get back to it."
- Speaker McPike: "That looks like it would be a better idea. Out of the record. Representative Homer asks leave to bring House Bill 3667 back to Second Reading and leave it there for Amendments. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. House Bill 3667 is on Second Reading. Representative Homer asks leave to bring House Bill 4124 from Third Reading to Second Reading and leave it there for

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Amendments. Is there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. House Bill 4124 is on Third...on Second Reading. Representative Matijevich moves that the House stand...Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I look at the board and I know it's late tonight, but on House Bill 4124 we've got two Wellers here, and I'm just curious, you know it may be some room for someone else to Cosponsor that Bill. Is there, is it my eyes, or is it time to adjourn, or what?" Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner...Representative Turner, Representative Weller claims he has been elected twice. Representative Matijevich moves the House stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at the hour of 9:00 a.m.. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the House stands adjourned leaving Perfunctory time for the Clerk for...for Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk Leone: "Messages from the Senate: a Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills 2253 and 2277, passed the Senate May 17, 1990. Linda Hawker, Secretary.' A further Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of following titles and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills 1958, 1962, 1977, 1985, 2001, 2014, 2020, 2037, 2050 and 2052, passed the Senate May 17, 1990. Linda Hawker, Secretary.' Further Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Bills of the following titles and passage of which I instructed to ask concurrence οf the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills 1752, 1767, 1768, 1776, 1850, 1864, 1877, 1881, 1897 and 1905, passed the Senate May 17, 1990. Linda Hawker, Secretary.' A further message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House οf Representatives that the Senate had passed Bills of the following titles and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills 1491, 1508, 1523, 1556, 1585, 1593, 1617, 1641, 1701 and 1704, 2082, 2086, 2089, 2102, 2101, 210...2115, 2168, 2176, 2237, 2239, 1051, 1487, 1496, 1511, 1515, 1531, 1565, 1571, 1573, 1588, 1591, 1627, 1638, 1639, 1649, 1659, 1710, 1723, 1727, 1730, 1738, 1773, 1838, 1840, 1845, 1847, 1856, 1861, 1882, 1906, 1949, 1960, 1974, 1991, 2009, 2026, 2028, 2036, 2038, 2039, 2054, 2056, 2059, 2067, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2083, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2099, 2100, 2104, 2108, 2109, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2119, 2124, 2127, 2131, 2145, 2147, 2155, 2166, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2186, 2187, 2193, 2195, 2209, 2210, 2216, 2217, 2222, 2229, 2275, 2276, 2306, 2308, 2309, 2312, 1535, 1536, 1537, 1783, 1784, 1785, 1786, 1788, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794, 1795, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1810, 1811, 1812, 1813, 1814, 1815, 1816, 1817, 1818, 1819, 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833, 18...correction that's 1922, 1926, 1929 and 1933, passed the Senate May 17, 1990. Linda Hawker, Secretary."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading: Senate Bill 2253,

Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Toxic Pollution

Prevention Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill,

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

2277, Phelps, a Bill for an Act to improve the delivery of health care services in Illinois. First Reading. 1958, Kulas, a Bill for an Act to authorize and conveyance of land in Cook County. First Reading. Bill, 1977, Mautino, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain work related deputy...disputes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1985, Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2001, Breslin, a Bill for an Act in relation to recyclable and degradable products. First Reading of the Senate Bill 2014, Peterson, a Bill for an Act to Bill. revise the law by signing short titles to various Acts. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2020, Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading Senate Bill 2037, Goforth, a Bill for an Act concerning natural resources and data collection. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2050, Lang, a Bill for an Act in relation to hospital payments. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2052, Munizzi, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1752, Ewing, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1767, Parke, a Bill for an Act in relation to grandparent visitation rights and adoption records. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1768, Novak, a Bill an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1776, Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1950, LeFlore, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1864, Goforth, a Bill for an Act Bill. amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1877, Novak, a Bill for an Act to create Bill.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

the Emerging Democracies Freedom Bond Act. First Reading the Bill. Senate Bill 1881, Currie, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1897, Richmond, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. 1905...strike that. Senate Bill 1491, Hicks, a Bill for an Act to repeal the All Terrain Vehicle Safety Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1508, Balanoff, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1523, Turner, a Bill for Act relating to scholarship programs and persons pursuing certain nursing degrees or diplomas. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1556, Hoffman, a Bill for Act relating to education and educational services for children in certain treatment facilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill, 1585, LeFlore, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1617, Trotter, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing...Illinois Nursing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1641, Wennlund, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1701, Goforth, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1704, Saltsman, a Bill for an Act concerning leave for fire fighters. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1051, Hicks, a Bill for an Act to create the Savings Bank Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1511, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act concerning Riverboat Gambling. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1515, Hensel, a Bill for an Act relating to crime statistics reports and security and procedures at institutions of higher education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Wait. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1573, Lou Jones, a Bill for an Act to amend the Voluntary Payroll Deduction Act. First Reading of the Bill. Ryder, а Bill for an Act to establish the Administrator and administrate the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1591, Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1649, Hicks, a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Estate Licensing Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1659, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act in relation to local government. First Reading Senate Bill 1710, Harris, a Bill for an Act to the Bill. amend the Counties Code. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1723, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1727, Hannig, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Farm Development Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1730, Hallock, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1738, Wait, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to authorize county boards in counties under township organization to organize certain territories situated therein as a town provide for annexation of territory and a disconnecting of territory from said town. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1773, Ropp, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to powers and duties of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1838, Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1840, McGann, a Bill for an Act in relation to youth with disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1845, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act amend the Electric Control Act. First Reading of the

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Bill. Senate Bill 1856, Hartke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1861, White, a Bill for an Act regarding emergency services. First Reading of the Bill. Piel Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Installment Loan Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1906, White, a Bill for an Act concerning Nursing Homes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Flowers, a Bill for an Act in relation to minority males. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1974, Parke, a Bill for an Act in relation to transportation. First Reading of Senate Bill 2009, Kubik, a Bill for an Act the Bill. relation to hearing impaired and behavior disordered children. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Kirkland. a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2036, Saltsman, a Bill for an Act to create the Tri-county River Valley Development Authority. First Reading of the Senate Bill 2038, Weaver, a Bill for an Act in relation to animal research and production facilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2039, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Humane Care for Animals Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2054, Leitch, a Bill for an Act amend the Mental Health Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 2056, Hicks, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2059, Saltsman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2078, Kirkland, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

2079, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2080, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2081, Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2083, Hicks, a Bill for an Act to create the Savings Bank Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2090, Parcells, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2091, Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2092, offered by Representative Piel, a an Act relating to the regulation of certain Bill for financial institutions. First Reading of the 2093, offered by Representative Kubik, a Bill for an Act concerning abused and neglected reports. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2094, offered by Representative Ryder, a Bill for an Act in relationship to motor vehicles and highways. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2099, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2100, offered Representative Didrickson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. 2104, offered by Representative Black, a Bill Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2108, offered by Myron Olson, a Bill for an Act amend the Children and Family Services Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2109, offered by Representative Hallock...and Goforth, a Bill for an Act relating to emergency management. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 2111...no Sponsor...correction. Senate Bill 2112.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act relationship to the establishment of uniform procedures for the seizure and forfeiture of drug related assets. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2113, offered bv Representative Weller, a Bill for an Act to amend the Steroid Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2119, offered by Representative Hallock, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2124, offered by Representative Deuchler, a Bill for an Act concerning land in Kane County owned by the Fox Valley Park District. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2131, offered by Representative Kirkland, a Bill for an Act concerning land in Kane County. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2145, offered by Representative McCracken...a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2147, offered by Representative Wojcik, a for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2082, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act in relationship to taxation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2086, offered by Representative Hasara, a for an Act to amend the Historic Preservation Agency Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2089. offered by Parke, a Bill for an Act concerning Representative children. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2102, offered by...correction...there is no Sponsor. Senate Bill 2110, offered by Representative Hicks - et al, a Bill for an Act in relationship to oil and gas. First Reading of Senate Bill 2115, offered by Representative the Bill. Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts. First of the Bill. Senate Bill 2168, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Liquor Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2183. offered by Representative Anthony Young, a Bill Act concerning contracting of certain services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2186. offered by Representative Hannig, a Bill for an Act to amend the Narcotics Profit Forfeiture Act. First Reading of the Bills. Senate Bill 2187, offered by Representative White and Wait, a Bill for an Act to amend various Acts in relationship to assistance for families. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2195, offered by Representative Levin, a Bill for an Act in relationship to rehabilitation disabled persons. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2209, offered by Representative Steczo, a Bill for Act to an Act to amend revise the law in relationship to First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate 2217, offered by Representative White, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the establishment of a medical center district in the City of Chicago and for the control and management thereof. First Reading of the Senate Bill 2222, offered by Representative Steczo. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2276, offered by Representative Santiago, a Bill for an Act to reduce illegal cannabis and controlled substances use and abuse and the effects of which use and abuse in this state. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2312, Representative Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1535, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and continuing expenses of the General Assembly. First Reading of

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Bill. Senate Bill 1536, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the furnishing of legislative, staff, secretarial, clerical, technical, telephone and other utility services, office equipment and office rental costs to Members of the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1537, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1784, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for education, higher education, education grant programs. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1785, offered by Representative Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1786, offered by Representative Hicks and Richmond, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1787. offered by Representative Ropp - Countryman - Hasara, Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill offered by Representative Matijevich, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1790, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1792, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1796, offered by Representative Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Asbestos Abatement Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

offered by Representative Hicks, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1798, offered Representative Hicks. Bill а for an Act appropriations in relationship to the Build Illinois Program. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1808. offered by Representative Hicks, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations to the Illinois Farm Development Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1810, offered by Representative Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Human Rights. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1811, offered by Representative Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Commission. First Reading of the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1816, Hicks, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Metro...Metropolitan Pier and Exhibition Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1826, Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. First Reading of Bill. Senate Bill 1827, Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1828, Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the ordinary and contingent expense of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1829. Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Guardianship Advocacy Commission. First Reading of the Bill.

119th Legislative Day

May 17, 1990

Bill 1831. Stephens. Bi 11 а for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Rehabilitation Services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1832, Stephens, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Veterans Affairs. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1922, Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Attorney General. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1926, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations appropriating money and awards and recommendations made by the Court of Claims. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1929. Bowman. Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Development Mental Health Disabilities. First Reading of Senate Bill 1933, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. First Reading of the There is no further business. The House now stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. May 18th."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

90/08/02 15:57:26 DEX

DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF E	JEBATE INDEX
MAY 17, 19	990
HD ACCA THIRD DEADYNG	DACE
HB-0569 THIRD READING HB-0569 MOTION	PAGE PAGE
HB-0934 RECALLED	PAGE
HB-0934 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-0934 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-0982 THIRD READING HB-0982 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-1014 SECOND READING	PAGE
HB-1268 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-1368 THIRD READING	PAGE
H3-2399 SECOND READING	PAGE
H3-2836 THIRD READING H8-2867 MOTION	PAGE PAGE
HB-2872 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-2699 THIRD READING	PAGE
. HB-2924 RECALLED	PAGE
H3-2924 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3001 THIRD READING HB-3024 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3024 MOTION	PAGE
HB-3042 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3043 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3058 RECALLED	PAGE
HB-3058 THIRD READING HB-3058 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3143 THIRD READING	PAGE
H8-3144 SECOND READING	PAGE
H8-3152 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3153 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3168 THIRD READING HB-3171 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3173 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3228 THIRD READING	PAGE
H3-3229 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3231 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3236 MOTION HB-3264 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HE-3264 MOTION	PAGE
HB-3266 MOTION	PAGE
HE-3270 MOTION	PAGE
HB-3271 THIRD READING HB-3272 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3304 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3317 MOTION	PAGE
HB-3323 SECOND READING	PAGE
HB-3323 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE
HB-3327 THIRD READING HB-3337 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3338 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3339 THIRD READING	PAGE
HE-3340 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3341 THIRD READING HB-3342 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3342 THIRD READING HB-3343 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3344 THIRD READING	PAGE
H3-3386 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3391 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3392 THIRD READING HB-3394 THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE
HB-3394 THIRD READING HB-3426 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3426 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3453 THIRD READING	PAGE
H8-3457 THIRD READING	PAGE
HB-3458 THIRD READING	PAGE

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

STATE OF ILLINOIS

86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 17, 1990

90/08/02 15:57:26

H3-3459	THIRD READING	PAGE	17
	THIRD READING	PAGE	17
	THIRD READING	PAGE	18
	THIRD READING	PAGE	18
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	19
	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	20 20
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	20
	THIRD READING	PAGE	21
	THIRD READING	PAGE	21
	THIRD READING	PAGE	22
	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
	THIRD READING	PAGE	22
	THIRD READING	PAGE	23
	THIRD READING	PAGE	23
	THIRD READING	PAGE	23
	THIRD READING	PAGE	24
	THIRD READING	PAGE	24
	THIRD READING	PAGE	25
	THIRD READING	PAGE	25
HB-3543	THIRD READING	PAGE	26
H8-3544	THIRD READING	PAGE	26
H3-3545	THIRD READING	PAGE	2 7
HB-3546	THIRD READING	PAGE	27
H8-3547	THIRD READING	PAGE	28
HB-3548	THIRD READING	PAGE	28
	THIRD READING	PAGE	29
	SECOND READING	PAGE	312
	THIRD READING	PAGE	237
	THIRD READING	PAGE	241
	THIRD READING	PAGE	245
	SECOND READING	PAGE	268
	SECOND READING	PAGE	272
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE Page	88 29
HB-3667		PAGE	316
	THIRD READING	PAGE	173
	SECOND READING	PAGE	37
	THIRD READING	PAGE	37
	SECOND READING	PAGE	217
	THIRD READING	PAGE	217
	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
	SECOND READING	PAGE	225
	THIRD READING	PAGE	226
	THIRD READING	PAGE	292
HB-3824	RECALLED	PAGE	179
Ha-3824	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
HB-3824	THIRD READING	PAGE	178
	THIRD READING	PAGE	186
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	41
	SECOND READING	PAGE	305
	RECALLED	PAGE	187
	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
	THIRD READING	PAGE	187
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	41
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	189
	THIRD READING	PAGE	189
	THIRD READING OUT OF RECORD	PAGE PAGE	306 190
HB-3832	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	73 4

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003 STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

90/08/02 15:57:26

MAY 17, 1990

HE-3895	SECOND READING	PAGE	298
	THIRD READING	PAGE	74
HB-3941		PAGE	168
	SECOND READING	PAGE	310
HB-3962	THIRD READING	PAGE	97
H6-3984	THIRD READING	PAGE	199
HB-4009		PAGE	100
	SECOND READING	PAGE	273
	THIRD READING	PAGE	174
HB-4042	RECALLED	PAGE	78
	THIRD READING	PAGE	78
	THIRD READING	PAGE	176
HB-4067		PAGE	279
	SECOND READING	PAGE	290
HB-4124		PAGE	316
HB-4126	RECALLED	PAGE	291
	THIRD READING	PAGE	294
HB-4152		PAGE	313
HB-4208	SECOND READING	PAGE	200
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	167
SB-1051	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
Sa-1491		PAGE	319
\$8-1508	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
\$8-1511		PAGE	320
SB-1515		PAGE	319
SB-1523	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
\$8-1531		PAGE	320
SB-1535		PAGE	325
SB-1536		PAGE	325
S3-1537	FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-1556		PAGE	319
SB-1573		PAGE	320
\$3-1585	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
SB-1588		PAGE	320
\$8-1591	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
SB-1617	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
SB-1641	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
S3-1649	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
Sa-1659	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
\$3-1701	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
SB-1704	FIRST READING	PAGE	319
\$3-1710	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
SB-1723	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
SS-1727		PAGE	320
SB-1730	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
S3-1738	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
SB-1752	FIRST READING	PAGE	316
SB-1767		PAGE	318
\$8-1768		PAGE	318
Sø-1773	FIRST READING	PAGE	320
S3-1776	FIRST READING	PAGE	318
Sa-1784	FIRST READING	PAGE	325
SB-1785	FIRST READING	PAGE	325
So-1786		PAGE	325
S8-1787	FIRST READING	PAGÉ	325
Sa-1789		PAGE	325
S3-1790		PAGE	325
\$3-1792		PAGE	325
Sd-1796		PAGE	325
SB-1797		PAGE	326
S3-1793		PAGE	326
\$3-1803		PAGE	326
\$3-1810		PAGE	326
S3-1811	FIRST READING	PAGE	326

REPORT: TIFLDAY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX HAY 17. 1990

STATE OF ILLINOIS

86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SB-1827 FIRST READING
SB-1825 FIRST READING
SB-1829 FIRST READING
SB-1831 FIRST READING
SB-1832 FIRST READING
SB-1830 FIRST READING SB-1840 FIRST READING SB-1845 FIRST READING SB-1856 FIRST READING SB-1861 FIRST READING SB-1864 FIRST READING SB-1877 FIRST READING SB-1881 FIRST READING SE-1882 FIRST READING SB-1906 FIRST READING SB-1922 FIRST READING SB-1926 FIRST READING Sd-1929 FIRST READING SB-1933 FIRST READING SB-1950 FIRST READING SB-1958 FIRST READING SB-1960 FIRST READING SB-1974 FIRST READING SB-1977 FIRST READING

SB-1985 FIRST READING

SB-2059 FIRST READING SB-2078 FIRST READING SB-2079 FIRST READING

SB-2080 FIRST READING

SB-2081 FIRST READING

SB-2032 FIRST READING SB-2033 FIRST READING SB-2086 FIRST READING

SB-2089 FIRST READING

SB-2090 FIRST READING

Sb-2091 FIRST READING SJ-2092 FIRST READING

SB-2093 FIRST READING

SB-2094 FIRST READING

SB-2099 FIRST READING

SB-2100 FIRST READING SB-2104 FIRST READING

S8-2108 FIRST READING

SB-2109 FIRST READING

SB-2110 FIRST READING SB-2112 FIRST READING

SB-2113 FIRST READING SB-2115 FIRST READING

SB-2001 FIRST READING Sb-2009 FIRST READING Sb-2014 FIRST READING SB-2020 FIRST READING SB-2026 FIRST READING SB-2028 FIRST READING SB-2036 FIRST READING SB-2037 FIRST READING SB-2031 FIRST READING
SB-2039 FIRST READING
SB-2050 FIRST READING
SB-2052 FIRST READING
SB-2054 FIRST READING
SB-2056 FIRST READING

PAGE PAGE

326

326

327

327

320

320

PAGE 326 PAGE 326 PAGE 326

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE 321 PAGE 322 PAGE 322

PAGE

90/08/02 15:57:26

318 321

318

322

322

323 322 323

323

322

322 322

322

322

322

322 322

322

322

323 323

323

323

86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

STATE OF ILLINOIS

	î	AY 17	1990
Sa-2119	FIRST	REAGII	NG
S8-2124	FIRST	READI	4G
\$6-2131	FIRST	READIA	VG
SB-2145	FIRST	READII	NG
SB-2147	FIRST	READIA	٧G
SB-2168	FIRST	READIA	1G
\$3-2171	FIRST	READIA	NG
\$8-2183	FIRST	READI	NG
SB-2186	FIRST	READI	NG
SB-2187	FIRST	READIA	NG
SB-2195	FIRST	READI	1G
Sa-2209	FIRST	READI	vG
SB-2210	FIRST	READIA	4G
SB-2217	FIRST	READI	vG
\$8-2222	FIRST	READIA	NG
SB-2253	FIRST	READI	NG
\$8-2254	CTOCT	PEAGL	u.c

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO GRDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE PRAYER - PASTOR STEPHENS

FIRST	READING
FIRST	READING
	FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST FIRST

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PERFUNCTORY SESSION

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

PERFUNCTORY ADJOURNMENT

ADJOURNMENT.

ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE

REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR REPRESENTATIVE CULLERTON IN THE CHAIR REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR

REPRESENTATIVE CULLERTON IN THE CHAIR

REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR

REPRESENTATIVE CULLERTUN IN THE CHAIR REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR

PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE 1

PAGE 1 PAGE 37 PAGE 147 PAGE 234 PAGE 251

PAGE PAGE 324 PAGE 324 324 324

323 323

324

324

324

324

324 PAGE 324 324

324

1 1

275

30.2

307

313

317

317

317

328

324 318

2

324

318

90/08/02

15:57:26